

Periodic Orbits of Gross Pitaevskii in the Disc with Vortices Following Point Vortex Flow

Raghavendra Venkatraman*

Indiana University, Bloomington.

March 14, 2016

Abstract

This article connects rotating solutions of the Gross-Pitaevskii system of PDE to those of the Point Vortex Flow (PVF) for all time. We first expand upon the collection of known rotating solutions to (PVF) in the unit disc. Then we establish the existence of rotating solutions to Gross-Pitaevskii whose vortices follow these periodic orbits or relative equilibria. We present two approaches, both variational- the first is via the strategy of momentum constrained minimization, while the second approach uses min-max linking arguments, adapted from [26]. A crucial advantage of the min-max approach is that we are able to construct periodic orbits with vortices of degrees ± 1 that do not succumb to vortex annihilation.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Renormalized Energy and the Point Vortex Flow	5
2.1	Periodic Solutions to Point Vortex Flow	6
2.2	A Modified Renormalized Energy	10
3	Outline and Technical Lemmas	10
3.1	Considerations of Symmetry	14
3.2	The Jacobian	16
4	Periodic Solutions to Gross-Pitaevskii via Constrained Minimization	19
4.1	Single Ring Solutions	20
4.2	Remarks on Multiple Ring Solutions	22
5	Periodic Solutions to Gross-Pitaevskii via Linking	22

*email: rvenkatr@umail.iu.edu

1 Introduction

We study non-constant time periodic solutions to the Gross-Pitaevskii equations

$$iu_t(x, t) = \Delta u(x, t) + \frac{u(x, t)(1 - |u(x, t)|^2)}{\varepsilon^2}, \quad (x, t) \in \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (1.1)$$

subject to the Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$u(e^{in\theta}, t) = g_n(\theta) := e^{in\theta}, \quad \theta \in [0, 2\pi), t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.2)$$

Here $\mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{C} \cong \mathbb{R}^2$ is the unit disc, n is a non-negative integer $u : \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. We are particularly interested in the asymptotic regime $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and in studying the relation between the zeroes of periodic solutions u_ε to (1.1) and periodic solutions to the corresponding point vortex flow, a system of ordinary differential equations described in Section 2 below. This problem is a very special, yet fairly rich case of the more general problem of finding time periodic solutions to the Gross-Pitaevskii equations above, with the unit disc $\mathbb{D}$ replaced by any simply connected smooth domain Ω and any boundary condition $g : \partial\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$. Our approach to obtaining periodic solutions to (1.1) will be variational in nature. Indeed, we will present results of two kinds, the first that are based on a constrained energy minimization procedure, while the second that are based on min-max linking arguments [44].

The Gross-Pitaevskii equations arise in a number of areas of physics such as superfluids, Bose-Einstein condensation (BEC) and non-linear optics, see for instance [9]. The time-periodic solutions to Gross-Pitaevskii that we construct are rotational, in the sense of an ansatz that we explain below in (3.2). Roughly, the vortices of our time periodic solutions rotate at a uniform angular velocity about the origin of the unit disc. The vortex configurations from the celebrated rotating bucket experiment, cf. [29], bear resemblance to those explored in this paper. However the emergence of vortices in experiments is achieved through an externally driven rotation of the domain, whereas here the presence of vortices is topologically enforced through the Dirichlet boundary condition.

The Gross-Pitaevskii equation, also occasionally referred to as the Ginzburg-Landau-Schrödinger equation, is a Hamiltonian system. Consequently, the flow defined by solutions to (1.1) conserves the Ginzburg-Landau energy

$$E_\varepsilon(u) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{D}} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2} (1 - |u|^2)^2 dx. \quad (1.3)$$

Existence of minimizers u_ε of (1.3) with respect to a Dirichlet boundary condition $g : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$, is an easy consequence of the Direct Method in the calculus of variations, whereas characterizing the limiting behavior of u_ε as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ is challenging and was the subject of [4]. The basic theme developed in [4] is this: the second term favors $|u| \approx 1$, whereas the Brouwer degree of g forces u to have vortices, i.e. zeroes carrying nonzero degree. This competition results in logarithmic divergence of the energy $E_\varepsilon(u) \sim \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. If we *remove* the logarithmic *core energy* contributed by the vortices, we are left with a finite dimensional *re-normalized* energy W , minimization of which decides the location of the vortices.

This paper is intended to be a rather simple case study to understand an abstract question that we explain below, concerning Hamiltonian flows of a Γ -converging sequence of energies. The theory of Γ -convergence of a sequence of functionals F_ε to its Γ -limit F_0 in some topology (X, τ) has its origins in relating global minimizers of F_ε to global minimizers of a limiting functional F_0 , as some small parameter $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. From a physical standpoint, the dependence of the functionals F_ε on $\varepsilon \ll 1$ might signify the dependence of the

underlying physical theory on some seemingly negligible yet significant parameter ε . The asymptotic analysis from Γ -convergence then captures an *effective theory* that does include the effects of the parameter ε . Somewhat surprisingly, Γ -convergence has subsequently proven to be a remarkable vehicle in other asymptotic analyses pertaining to the functionals F_ε and F_0 . We recall a few such surprises that are known in abstract generality, along with applications of these general theorems:

- In [22], the authors demonstrate that given an isolated local minimizer of F_0 , one can use Γ -convergence to construct local minimizers of the functionals F_ε for all sufficiently small ε . When the limiting problem F_0 is geometric, their theorem reduces the task of solving nonlinear partial differential equations to solving a geometric problem which is often easier to visualize. There have been several applications of this result, we mention [17] and [31] in the context of Ginzburg–Landau.
- In [36] and [38], the authors study gradient flow dynamics

$$u_t^\varepsilon = -\delta_u F_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)$$

and relate these to gradient flows of the functional F_0 , via a sort of C^1 Γ -convergence. In the same paper, they applied their abstract theorem to recover the asymptotics of solutions to the parabolic Ginzburg Landau system proven in [20] and [25], and also prove asymptotics of gradient flow of the magnetic Ginzburg–Landau energy via variational methods, recovering the results of [41] where these asymptotics were proved using PDE methods.

- In [40], the author shows that information pertaining to the second variation functional $\delta^2 F_\varepsilon$ passes to the limit, using a C^2 Γ -convergence. An application of this result is to show that under homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions, any sequence of non-constant critical points of Ginzburg Landau (1.3) must be unstable in the sense of second variation, provided ε is sufficiently small.
- In [21], the authors are able to prove the existence of general critical points to the functionals F_ε near non-degenerate critical points of the limiting problem F_0 . They then apply their general theorem to show the existence of critical points to a number of examples where F_0 is, loosely speaking, perimeter, such as 3D Ginzburg–Landau with and without a magnetic field.

In light of the discussion above, when F_ε, F_0 are functionals on complex-valued functions, it is very natural to ask to relate conservative dynamics of the functionals F_ε , written schematically as

$$(u_t^\varepsilon)^\perp = -\delta_u F_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon),$$

to corresponding flows for F_0 . We are unaware of abstract theorems answering such a question— we do not have anything new to say about this question in generality, but we can address it in detail for the special case of (1.1)–(1.2).

There are specific results related to the question described above when the F_ε are given by the Ginzburg–Landau energy, proved in various settings and under different boundary conditions, see for instance [6], [7], [28], and with refined estimates, [18] – all of these results are valid for *finite* time $[0, T_1]$, where T_1 is the first collision time. Pursuing the Ginzburg–Landau example further, our interest is to construct solutions to the Gross–Pitaevskii equation above, that follow the Hamiltonian evolution of the re-normalized energy *for all time*. Let us be more concrete about this. The Hamiltonian flow generated on its phase space, viz. Euclidean space endowed with the standard symplectic form, by the re-normalized energy W is called the point vortex flow.

Given certain periodic solutions to point vortex flow, for $\varepsilon \ll 1$ we construct periodic solutions $u^\varepsilon(x, t)$ to Gross Pitaevskii with the following asymptotic property: for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the Jacobians $Ju^\varepsilon(\cdot, t)$ converge as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to a sum of Dirac delta functions whose support consists of points that flow along the given periodic orbit to point vortex flow.

Our arguments will be variational in nature, relying rather heavily on symmetry. It is for this reason that we are only able to treat the rather special boundary conditions (1.2) in this note. As mentioned before, we present results of two kinds- the first type of results proceed by the method of constrained minimization and is contained in Theorem 4.4. In the context of Gross Pitaevskii, this approach was used in [12] to study rotating solutions on $\mathbb{S}^2$. We borrow several ideas from [12]. Our second set of results are presented in Theorems 5.1 and 5.6. Existence of periodic orbits, proved in Theorem 5.1, proceeds via min-max arguments applied to a certain elliptic PDE. We have adapted the localized linking argument in the proof of this result from [26]. We present asymptotics of the periodic solutions constructed in Theorem 5.1 in Theorem 5.6, where we rely heavily on the analysis in [4]. The starting point of both the constrained minimization approach and the min-max approach is to pursue solutions of (1.1)-(1.2) within a rotation ansatz given in (3.2) below that was originally suggested to us by Professor Robert L Jerrard in the case $n = 1$ of a single vortex.

A salient feature of our min-max approach that distinguishes it, for example from [26] is that we are able to capture periodic orbits of Gross-Pitaevskii containing vortices of opposite degrees ± 1 . To the best of our knowledge, in the presence of a Dirichlet boundary condition, such solutions to (1.1) that do not succumb to finite time vortex annihilation are new. In particular, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, these solutions follow the Point Vortex system *for all time*.

The point vortex system is a system of ordinary differential equations that govern the dynamics of limiting vortices of Gross Pitaevskii. They arise from the re-normalized energy identified in [4] by considering its Hamiltonian flow. This system of ODE's also arises in fluid mechanics, and corresponds to the Euler equations, with vorticity given by a sum of Dirac deltas, see [30] Chapter 4 for a precise statement. The boundary conditions (1.2) then correspond to specifying constant tangential velocity of the fluid along the boundary. The references [19, 39, 28] contain results on the hydrodynamic limits of the Gross-Pitaevskii equations. In this paper we will be exclusively concerned with *relative equilibria*- these are periodic solutions to point vortex flow where vortices appear stationary from a uniformly rotating frame. Periodic solutions to the point vortex system have been considered before, but to the best of our knowledge, primarily *without* boundary conditions, and when posed on all of $\mathbb{C}$. For a survey of the point vortex problem in various settings, we refer the reader to [2], [33]. The point vortex problem posed on the unit disc has received some attention- [8, 3, 11, 42] are the papers that we are aware of. Section 2 contains a review of essential features of this problem, and a general recipe to obtain possible relative equilibria in the disc that possess certain symmetry properties. This general scheme appears to be new to the best of our knowledge.

Acknowledgements

This work is part of my PhD Thesis at Indiana University. I am extremely grateful to my thesis adviser, Professor Peter Sternberg, for his invaluable advise, his seemingly endless patience, and for a very careful reading of an earlier draft of this paper that substantially clarified the exposition. Thanks are also due to Professor Robert L. Jerrard who suggested the rotational ansatz for the case of a single vortex, i.e. $n = k = m = 1$ in Eq. (3.2) below. I also thank Vivekanand Dabade for help with making Figure 4. Finally, I am happy to acknowledge the support of the National Science Foundation through D.M.S. 1101290 and D.M.S.1362879.

Notation

We will frequently identify a complex number $z = z_1 + iz_2$, where $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, with the point $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Consequently, given a pair of complex numbers $z, w = w_1 + iw_2$, we write $(z, w) := z_1 w_1 + z_2 w_2$, i.e. their dot product as vectors in $\mathbb{R}^2$. We emphasize that this is a real inner product. By abuse of notation, given $u \in \mathbb{C}$ and $v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$, we will also write $(u, v) = ((u, v_1), (u, v_2)) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. For any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, we use the notation

$$e(\beta) = e^{i\beta}.$$

The unit circle $\{e(\beta)\}_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}}$ acts on the unit disc by rotation. In $\mathbb{R}^2$, this is equivalent to left multiplication by the rotation matrix

$$R(\beta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{pmatrix}.$$

The symplectic matrix $J := R(\pi/2)$ will play a particularly important role, since it is equivalent to multiplication by i . Given $v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we write $v^\perp := (-v_2, v_1)$.

Next, if $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^2$, where $v = (v_1, v_2), w = (w_1, w_2)$, then $v \times w = v_1 w_2 - v_2 w_1$. Balls of radius $R > 0$, centered at a point x are denoted $B_R(x)$. Unless otherwise mentioned, balls are open.

Arithmetic: Given integers $a \neq 0, b$ we will write $a|b$, if a divides b , i.e. there exists an integer c which is different from 0 such that $b = ac$. When a does not divide b , we will write $a \nmid b$.

Constants and the Landau notations: Generic constants will be denoted by C , and the value of C may vary from line to line. Such constants are always finite and positive but *seldom* depend on ε . Constants with subscripts such as c_1 stay the same within the proof in which they occur. Also for two quantities Ψ_ε and Λ_ε depending on ε , we write $\Psi_\varepsilon = o_\varepsilon(\Lambda_\varepsilon)$ to mean $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Psi_\varepsilon}{\Lambda_\varepsilon} = 0$. We write $\Psi_\varepsilon = O_\varepsilon(\Lambda_\varepsilon)$ if there exists a constant C with $|\Psi_\varepsilon| \leq C|\Lambda_\varepsilon|$ whenever ε is sufficiently small.

Function spaces: Function spaces will (unless mentioned otherwise) generally consist of complex valued functions, and we will frequently suppress this from notation. For example,

$$H_g^1(\Omega) := \{u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, u \in H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{C}), u|_{\partial\Omega} = g\}.$$

Miscellaneous: For any integer $k \geq 1$ we denote as usual by $\mathbb{D}^k$ the k -fold Cartesian product of $\mathbb{D}$ with itself, and

$$(\mathbb{D}^*)^k := \{b = (b_1, \dots, b_k) \in \mathbb{D}^k, b_i \neq b_j \text{ if } i \neq j\}.$$

Finally given a set $S \subset \mathbb{C}$ and a complex number $\lambda \neq 0$, we write

$$\lambda S := \{\lambda s : s \in S\}. \tag{1.4}$$

Furthermore, since $\mathbb{C}^k$ is a k -dimensional complex vector space, for any point $p \in \mathbb{C}^k$, with $p = (p_1, \dots, p_k)$, we write $\lambda p = (\lambda p_1, \dots, \lambda p_k) \in \mathbb{C}^k$, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.

2 Renormalized Energy and the Point Vortex Flow

In this section we recall the re-normalized energy identified in [4]. The re-normalized energy is a function of vortex locations and associated vortex strengths. We recall that for $b \in (\mathbb{D}^*)^N$, and vortex strength $d =$

$(d_1, \dots, d_N) \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ with $\sum d_i = n$,

$$W(b, d) := -\pi \sum_{j \neq k} d_j d_k \log |b_j - b_k| - \pi \sum_{j=1}^N d_j R_0(b_j) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial \mathbb{D}} \Phi_0(g \times g_\tau). \quad (2.1)$$

Here Φ_0 is the unique solution to the linear problem

$$\Delta \Phi_0 = 2\pi \sum_{j=1}^N d_j \delta_{b_j}, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{D}, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\partial_\nu \Phi_0|_{\partial \mathbb{D}} = g \times g_\tau, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\int_{\partial \mathbb{D}} \Phi_0 = 0; \quad (2.4)$$

and we define

$$R_0(z) := \Phi_0(z) - \sum_{j=1}^N d_j \log |z - b_j|. \quad (2.5)$$

Note that R_0 defines a continuous function in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. When $g = g_n$, it is clear that $g \times g_\tau \equiv n$. In this case, the formula (2.1) for the re-normalized energy assumes the explicit form in (2.6) below. Since we are unaware of a reference to this calculation, let us briefly describe the steps involved. Using the Poisson integral formula with Neumann boundary conditions to solve the linear problem (2.2)-(2.4) yields a formula for Φ_0 involving a logarithmic Greens function term (the second term on the right hand side of (2.5)) and a logarithmic corrector term that involves the inversion of a point about the unit circle $z \mapsto \frac{1}{\bar{z}}$. Since the definition of R_0 involves subtracting off the Greens term we obtain the following explicit formula for the re-normalized energy.

$$W(b, d) = -\pi \sum_{j \neq k} d_j d_k \log |b_j - b_k| - \pi \sum_{j,k=1}^N d_j d_k \log |1 - \bar{b}_j b_k|. \quad (2.6)$$

Note first that W still depends on the degree n of the boundary conditions via $\sum d_i = n$. It is also crucial to notice for what follows that W is invariant under the action of rotations in the sense that for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, if we write $e(\theta)b = (e(\theta)b_1, \dots, e(\theta)b_N)$, then $W(b, d) = W(e(\theta)b, d)$. Next, we recall several periodic solutions to the Point Vortex Flow posed in the unit disc.

2.1 Periodic Solutions to Point Vortex Flow

The point vortex flow is a system of ordinary differential equations defined by

$$d_j \left(\frac{db_j}{dt} \right)^\perp = -\frac{1}{\pi} \nabla_{b_j} W(b), \quad j = 1, \dots, N. \quad (2.7)$$

Using (2.6), we re-write (2.7) as the system

$$d_\ell \frac{\overline{db_\ell(t)}}{dt} = -2i \left(\sum_{k \neq \ell} \frac{d_k}{b_\ell(t) - b_k(t)} + \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{d_k \overline{b_k(t)}}{1 - \overline{b_k(t)} b_\ell(t)} \right), \quad \ell = 1, \dots, N. \quad (\text{PVF}) \quad (2.8)$$

This system of equations is Hamiltonian- the phase space is $(\mathbb{D}^*)^N$ and the symplectic structure is the standard one inherited from $\mathbb{C}^N$. As a consequence, the Point Vortex Flow (PVF) conserves the Hamiltonian (2.6).

In addition, this flow also conserves a momentum-like quantity. For any $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_N) \in (\mathbb{D}^*)^N$, $d = (d_1, \dots, d_N) \in \{\pm 1\}^N$, define

$$\mathcal{J}_0(b, d) = \frac{-1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N d_j |b_j|^2, \quad (2.9)$$

The following Lemma is an easy calculation.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $(b(t), d) = (b_1(t), \dots, b_N(t); d_1, \dots, d_N)$ be a solution to (2.8). Then*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{J}_0(b(t)) = 0. \quad (2.10)$$

We will now construct some relative equilibria, i.e. uniformly rotating periodic solutions to the ODE system (2.8). These are solutions obtained by pursuing the ansatz

$$b_\ell(t) = b_\ell e(-\tilde{\omega}t), \quad (2.11)$$

where $b_\ell \in \mathbb{D}$ is a *fixed* complex number and $\tilde{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}$. Several studies have been devoted to studying such solutions for the point vortex problem on $\mathbb{C}$, see [2] for an extensive survey. For the unit disc with boundary conditions as in (1.2), the simplest such solution is that with a single ring of n vortices located at the vertices of a regular n -gon. These are known as vortex polygons and have been known way back since [47]. In this case, one can show (cf.[8],[47]) that the radius of rotation ρ and the angular speed ω_0 are related by

$$\omega_0 \frac{\rho^2}{2} = - \left(\frac{n-1}{2} + \frac{n\rho^{2n}}{1-\rho^{2n}} \right). \quad (2.12)$$

Observe that $\omega_0 < 0$. Furthermore, if the momentum value $\mathcal{J}_0 = -\frac{\rho^2}{2}$ is prescribed, then ω_0 is uniquely determined from (2.12).

As mentioned in the Introduction there have been some recent works that pursue existence and stability issues related to relative equilibria in the disc, see for instance [8, 11, 42] and references therein. For the convenience of the reader, we provide below a general framework for constructing families of relative equilibria, based on symmetry considerations. This framework in particular, yields as special cases relative equilibria constructed in the aforementioned articles. To the best of our knowledge, this general framework, which reduces the problem of finding relative equilibria *in the unit disc* to solving systems of algebraic equations, is new. We closely follow a similar such program carried out in [24] for the point vortex flow posed in $\mathbb{C}$.

For reasons that will be apparent in Section 4, let $k > 1$ be a divisor of n . We will construct a relative equilibrium that is fixed by the group of rotations through angle $\frac{2\pi}{k}$. Let $N_- > 1$ be the number of degree -1 vortices. Then N_- needs to be a multiple of k . The number of positive vortices $N_+ = n + N_-$ and hence the total number of vortices is $N = n + 2N_-$. The numbers $N, N_\pm$ are clearly multiples of k .

Given this set up, let us index the rings by Latin subscripts such as r, s that range from $1, \dots, \frac{N}{k}$ and index vortices in a given ring with a second Greek sub-script. Thus, vortices on the r th ring, containing k vortices each of strength $d_r \in \{\pm 1\}$, are labeled $(\zeta_{r\beta})_{\beta=0}^{k-1}$. Then the equations (2.8) take the form

$$\begin{aligned} d_r \frac{\overline{d\zeta_{r\beta}(t)}}{dt} = & -2i \left(\sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} \frac{d_r}{\zeta_{r\beta}(t) - \zeta_{r\alpha}(t)} + \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k-1} \frac{d_r \overline{\zeta_{r\alpha}(t)}}{1 - \overline{\zeta_{r\alpha}(t)} \zeta_{r\beta}(t)} \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{s \neq r} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k-1} \frac{d_s}{\zeta_{r\beta}(t) - \zeta_{s\alpha}(t)} + \sum_{s \neq r} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k-1} \frac{d_s \overline{\zeta_{s\alpha}(t)}}{1 - \overline{\zeta_{s\alpha}(t)} \zeta_{r\beta}(t)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

We seek solutions of the form

$$\zeta_{r\beta}(t) = e\left(\frac{2\pi\beta}{k}\right) \zeta_r(t).$$

Plugging in this ansatz into (2.13) and computing as in [8] we find,

$$d_r \zeta_r(t) \overline{\zeta_r'(t)} = -2i \left(\frac{k-1}{2} + \frac{d_r k |\zeta_r(t)|^{2k}}{1 - |\zeta_r(t)|^{2k}} + k \sum_{s \neq r} d_s \zeta_r^k(t) \left\{ \frac{1}{\zeta_r^k(t) - \zeta_s^k(t)} + \frac{\overline{\zeta_s^k(t)}}{1 - \overline{\zeta_s^k(t)} \zeta_r^k(t)} \right\} \right). \quad (2.14)$$

Seeking relative equilibria, we seek an ansatz of the form

$$\zeta_r(t) = e(-\omega_0 t) \zeta_r,$$

where $\zeta_r \in \mathbb{D}$. We obtain

$$-d_r \omega_0 |\zeta_r|^2 = 2 \left(\frac{k-1}{2} + \frac{d_r k |\zeta_r|^{2k}}{1 - |\zeta_r|^{2k}} + k \sum_{s \neq r} d_s \zeta_r^k \left\{ \frac{1}{\zeta_r^k - \zeta_s^k} + \frac{\overline{\zeta_s^k}}{1 - \overline{\zeta_s^k} \zeta_r^k} \right\} \right). \quad (2.15)$$

This last expression holds for each $r = 1, \dots, \frac{N}{k}$. Thus for each r , it is necessary that

$$\sum_{s \neq r} d_s \zeta_r^k \left\{ \frac{1}{\zeta_r^k - \zeta_s^k} + \frac{\overline{\zeta_s^k}}{1 - \overline{\zeta_s^k} \zeta_r^k} \right\} \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.16)$$

Writing $\zeta_s = \rho_s e(\phi_s)$, we introduce $\mu_{sr} = \frac{\rho_s}{\rho_r}$, $\nu_{sr} = \rho_s \rho_r$, and $\psi_{sr} = \phi_s - \phi_r$. Inserting this in the last equation, we find that (2.16) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{s \neq r} d_s \sin(k\psi_{sr}) \left(P_{sr}(\mu_{sr}^k) - P_{sr}\left(\frac{1}{\nu_{sr}^k}\right) \right) = 0, \quad (2.17)$$

with

$$P_{sr}(t) := \frac{2t}{1 - 2t \cos(k\psi_{sr}) + t^2} \quad (2.18)$$

holding for each $r = 1, \dots, \frac{N}{k}$.

The conditions (2.17) are satisfied provided

$$\sin(k\psi_{sr}) = 0, \quad (2.19)$$

or in other words, that $\phi_s - \phi_r = 0$ or $\frac{\pi}{k}$ (only mod $\frac{2\pi}{k}$ matters because of symmetry (3.1)). We have not pursued the necessity of (2.19) in order that (2.17) holds, but it appears to be true for small k, n .

If for each pair of distinct s, r one has $\phi_s - \phi_r = 0$, the relative equilibrium is said to be an *aligned* configuration. In such an arrangement, the vortices lie on the same "rays" emanating out of the origin (cf. Figure 2.1).




Figure 2: An staggered configuration. The solid and hollow bullets indicate possibly different degrees. $k = 4$. Not to scale.




Figure 1: An aligned configuration. The solid and hollow bullets indicate possibly different degrees. $k = 6$. Not to scale.

If on the other hand, $\phi_s - \phi_r = \frac{\pi}{k}$, for some s, r the resulting arrangement of vortices is said to be a *staggered* or *alternate* configuration (cf. Figure 2.1).

Returning to (2.15), and fixing values of ψ_{sr} , results in a system of coupled algebraic equations with ring radii as unknowns. At this stage, the authors in [24] exhibit numerical examples in which they can solve the resulting system of algebraic equations. It is however important to note that vortex strengths can be arbitrary real numbers in [24], whereas $d_r \in \mathbb{Z}$ for our purposes. In fact, in this paper, we limit ourselves to relative equilibria in which $d_r \in \{\pm 1\}$ for every r . Except for the few examples that we collect below, we have not strenuously attempted the difficult problem of finding further relative equilibria for (PVF) in the disc for the following reason: as long as $(a_1, d_1), \dots, (a_N, d_N)$ is *any* relative equilibrium to (PVF) in the disc, with $\{d_j\} \in \{\pm 1\}$, and satisfies certain symmetry conditions explained in Section 3.1 below, our Theorems 5.1-5.6 yield periodic solutions to (1.1)-(1.2) that follow this relative equilibrium for all time.

Here are a few cases where one can solve the resulting system of algebraic equations.

- Suppose $N_- = 0$, so $N = N_+ = n = km$. Further suppose that $\psi_{sr} = 0$. In other words we have m rings of k vortices each, all rings being aligned. In this case, for any $p \in (\frac{-n}{2}, 0)$ there exist ring radii $0 < \varrho_1 < \varrho_2 < \dots < \varrho_m < 1$ solving the preceding system of algebraic equations. The case $m = 1$ is immediate and is (2.12). The case $m = 2$ can be found in [8], and the general case follows by induction on m . Further the angular velocity in this case is given by adding the equations (2.15). One obtains

$$-\omega_0(\varrho_1^2 + \dots + \varrho_m^2) = 2 \left(m \frac{k-1}{2} + k \binom{m}{2} + k \sum_{r,s=1}^m \frac{(\varrho_r \varrho_s)^k}{1 - (\varrho_r \varrho_s)^k} \right).$$

Observe once again that $\omega_0 < 0$. Furthermore, setting $m = 1$, along with the convention that the binomial coefficient $\binom{1}{2} = 0$ yield the classical solution (2.12).

- Suppose $m = 2$ and $\psi_{12} = \frac{\pi}{k}$. In this case define $r_0(k) = (\sqrt{4k^2 + 1} - 2k)^{1/2k}$. If $d_1 = 1$ and $d_2 = -1$, then for any $r < r_0(k)$ there exist $0 < \varrho_1 < r < \varrho_2 < 1$ such that k degree $+1$ vortices located at radius ϱ_1 , and k degree -1 vortices located at radius ϱ_2 in a ring skewed relative to the first one, form a uniformly rotating relative equilibrium. On the other hand, if $d_1 = -1$ and $d_2 = 1$ then for any $r > r_0$ there exist $0 < \varrho_1 < r < \varrho_2 < 1$ such that the same is true.
- The special case with $\varrho_1 = \varrho_2$ is a relative equilibrium if and only if $\varrho_1 = \varrho_2 = r_0$. In this case

$$\omega_0 = \frac{4k + 1 - \sqrt{4k^2 + 1}}{8\pi(\sqrt{4k^2 + 1} - 2k)^{1/2k}}(d_1 + d_2).$$

In particular if we have that $d_1 + d_2 = 0$ then $\omega_0 = 0$. In other words, it is a critical point of the re-normalized energy W .

2.2 A Modified Renormalized Energy

We conclude this section with the following definition. Suppose $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_N) \in (\mathbb{D}^*)^N$ and $d = (d_1, \dots, d_N) \in \{\pm 1\}^N$ with $\sum d_i = n$. Suppose further that for some divisor k of n , the points $\mathbf{b}$ possess k fold symmetry as explained earlier, and set $m = \frac{n}{k}$. Then pursuing the ansatz as in (2.11) with $\frac{\omega_0}{m}$ in place of $\tilde{\omega}$ we are led to finding critical points of the functional

$$\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\mathbf{b}, d) := \frac{1}{\pi} W(\mathbf{b}, d) - \frac{\omega_0}{m} \mathcal{J}_0(\mathbf{b}, d), \quad (2.20)$$

with $\mathcal{J}_0$ defined as in Eq. (2.9). We note that when $\omega_0 \neq 0$, the time-period of rotation of these periodic solutions to (PVF) is given by

$$T = \frac{2\pi m}{\omega_0}. \quad (2.21)$$

Remark 2.2. When the degree $d = (d_1, \dots, d_N)$ has been fixed, we will frequently *drop* the dependence on d from our notation, but continue to denote by $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\mathbf{b}) = \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\mathbf{b}, d)$ as a convenient abuse of notation.

3 Outline and Technical Lemmas

Let us first consider solutions $u(x, t) = u(r, \theta, t)$ such that

$$u\left(r, \theta + \frac{2\pi}{k}, t\right) = u(r, \theta, t), \quad r \in (0, 1], \theta \in [0, 2\pi], t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.1)$$

where $k \geq 1$ is an integer. In order for this symmetry property to be consistent with the boundary condition (1.2), it is necessary that k divides n . Set $n = km$. The relative equilibria from the preceding section suggest pursuing the ansatz

$$u(x, t) = R(-k\omega t)v\left(R\left(\frac{\omega}{m}t\right)x\right), \quad (3.2)$$

where $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ is an unknown angular velocity and $v : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. We remark that this ansatz is consistent with the boundary condition if and only if $n = km$. Moreover, the assumed k -fold symmetry property of u from (3.1) reflects itself via a similar property for v :

$$v\left(r, \theta + \frac{2\pi}{k}\right) = v(r, \theta). \quad (3.3)$$

Observe from (3.2) that the function u is periodic with time period

$$T = \frac{2\pi m}{\omega},$$

compare this with (2.21). Using this ansatz in (1.1), we arrive at the following elliptic partial differential equation

$$\Delta v(y) + \frac{v}{\varepsilon^2}(1 - |v|^2)(y) = \omega \left(kv + \frac{1}{m}y^\perp \cdot \nabla v^\perp \right)(y), \quad y \in \mathbb{D}, \quad (3.4)$$

$$v(e^{i\theta}) = e^{in\theta}. \quad (3.5)$$

The PDE (3.4) has variational structure. For $v \in H^1(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$, recall that we have defined the Ginzburg Landau energy functional (1.3). Next, define

$$\mathcal{J}(v) := -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{D}} k|v|^2 + \frac{1}{m}v \cdot (y^\perp \cdot \nabla)v^\perp dy. \quad (3.6)$$

Given these definitions, we note (formally) that (3.4) is the Euler-Lagrange system of the action functional

$$\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^\omega(u) = \int_{\mathbb{D}} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon^2}(1 - |u|^2)^2 + \frac{\omega}{2} \int_{\mathbb{D}} k|u|^2 + \frac{1}{m}u \cdot (y^\perp \cdot \nabla)u^\perp dy. \quad (3.7)$$

Remark 3.1. In solving the PDE (1.1)-(1.2), we may assume that the integer $n \geq 0$, since the cases $n < 0$ follow by complex conjugation. Moreover, in ansatz (3.2) above, we have implicitly assumed that $n \geq 1$ to ensure that $m \neq 0$. The case $n = 0$ can easily be fit into this framework: obviously, the relation $n = km$ is symmetric in k and m , since k and m are both divisors of n . Now when $n = 0$, use the ansatz (3.2) with $k = 0$ and m be *any* (non-zero) integer that reflects the desired symmetry property of the function v .

From a related viewpoint, (3.4) also arises as the system of partial differential equations satisfied by minimizers of (1.3) subject to the constraint $\mathcal{J}(v) = p$, for $p \in \mathbb{R}$, with ω emerging as a Lagrange multiplier.

Physically, pursuing the ansatz (3.2) amounts to studying the PDE (1.1)-(1.2) from a uniformly rotating coordinate frame. In this framework, the Hamiltonian structure of (1.1) manifests itself as conservation of the energy E_ε and momentum $\mathcal{J}$. In the remainder of this section we collect several preliminary results. We begin by proving that the functional $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^\omega$ has the Palais-Smale property for any $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. The functional $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^\omega$ satisfies the Palais-Smale condition in the space $H^1(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we may set $\varepsilon = 1$, and let $\{u_j\}$ be a Palais-Smale sequence, so that

$$|\mathcal{E}^\omega(u_j)| \leq C$$

and

$$\delta\mathcal{E}^\omega(u_j) \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } H^{-1}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C}).$$

The Energy bound immediately yields a uniform H^1 bound by Hölder's inequality. By Alaoglu and Rellich theorems, we conclude that there exists $u \in H^1(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$ such that

$$u_j \rightharpoonup u \text{ weakly in } H^1 \quad (3.8)$$

$$u_j \rightarrow u \text{ strongly in } L^p \text{ for all } p \in [1, \infty). \quad (3.9)$$

We must improve the weak convergence in (3.8) to strong convergence. We make use of the fact that $\delta\mathcal{E}^\omega(u_j)u_j \rightarrow 0$, $\mathcal{E}^\omega(u_j)u \rightarrow 0$, and standard facts about weak convergence to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int |\nabla u_j|^2 &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int |u_j|^2(1 - |u_j|^2) - \omega_0 \int k|u_j|^2 + \frac{1}{m} u_j \cdot (y^\perp \cdot \nabla u_j^\perp) \\ &= \int |u|^2(1 - |u|^2) - \omega_0 \int k|u|^2 + \frac{1}{m} u \cdot (y^\perp \cdot \nabla u^\perp) \\ &= \int |\nabla u|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

This completes the proof. □

Our next technical lemma is a maximum principle for solutions to (3.4).

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$, and let v_ε be a smooth solution to (3.4). Then for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small,*

$$|v_\varepsilon| \leq 1 + O(\varepsilon^2), \quad (3.11)$$

and there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$|\nabla v_\varepsilon| \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon}. \quad (3.12)$$

Proof. We first prove (3.11), whose proof follows from an interesting partial differential identity. For brevity we suppress dependence of v on ε . Set $u = |v|^2$. Since $\Delta u = 2|\nabla v|^2 + 2v \cdot \Delta v$, we calculate that

$$\Delta u = 2\omega k u - 2 \frac{u(1 - |v|^2)}{\varepsilon^2} - \frac{\omega^2}{m^2} (y_1^2 + y_2^2) u + P, \quad (3.13)$$

where P is positive:

$$\begin{aligned} P &= |\nabla v|^2 + \left(-\frac{\omega}{m} v_1 y_1 + \partial_{y_2} v_2 \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\omega}{m} y_2 v_1 + \partial_{y_1} v_2 \right)^2 + \left(-\frac{\omega}{m} v_2 y_1 + \partial_{y_2} v_1 \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\omega}{m} v_2 y_2 + \partial_{y_1} v_1 \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\Delta u - u \left(2\omega k - 2 \frac{(1 - |v|^2)}{\varepsilon^2} - \frac{\omega^2 (y_1^2 + y_2^2)}{m^2} \right) \geq 0.$$

Note $u|_{\partial\mathbb{D}} \equiv 1$. Then the bound

$$|v(y_1, y_2)|^2 \leq 1 - \varepsilon^2 \left(\omega k + \frac{\omega^2}{2m^2} (y_1^2 + y_2^2) \right)$$

for all $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{D}$ follows by a standard maximum principle-type argument. This completes the proof of (3.11). The proof of (3.12) now follows from elliptic estimates (see for instance [14], Chapter 8). $\square$

Suppose next that we are given a finite collection of points and associated integers, whose sum is the degree n of the given boundary condition. The goal of the next proposition is to construct an H^1 function which nearly optimizes the Ginzburg Landau energy in the sense of (3.15), and nearly saturates the corresponding momentum constraint in the sense of (3.14).

Proposition 3.4. *Let $N \geq 1$ be an integer and let $p = (p_1, \dots, p_N) \in (\mathbb{D}^*)^N$ and $d = (d_1, \dots, d_N) \in \{\pm 1\}^N$, with $\sum_{i=1}^N d_i = n$. Then for $\varepsilon > 0$ small, there exists a function $w_p^\varepsilon \in H_{g_n}^1(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$ which satisfies the following.*

1. $w_p^\varepsilon(x) = 0$ if and only if $x = p_i$. Outside the disjoint balls $(B_{2\varepsilon}(p_j))_{j=1}^N$, one has that $|w_p^\varepsilon| = 1$, and consequently $\deg(w_p^\varepsilon, p_i)$ is well defined. We have $\deg(w_p^\varepsilon, p_i) = d_i$.
2. Let $\mathcal{J}_0(p, d)$ be as in (2.9). Then

$$\left| \mathcal{J}(w_p^\varepsilon) - \frac{\pi}{m} \mathcal{J}_0(p, d) \right| = o_\varepsilon(1) \quad (3.14)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

3. The Ginzburg Landau energy $E_\varepsilon(w_p^\varepsilon)$ satisfies the asymptotic development

$$E_\varepsilon(w_p^\varepsilon) = N \left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma \right) + W(p, d) + o_\varepsilon(1) \quad (3.15)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ where γ is a universal constant identified in [4].

4. (Symmetry property) Let now k be a divisor of n and let $m = \frac{n}{k}$. Suppose that the points p and their associated degrees d are preserved under rotation by angles $\frac{2\pi j}{k}$, $0 \leq j \leq k-1$. Then we may arrange that

$$w_p^\varepsilon(r, \frac{2\pi}{k} + \theta) = w_p^\varepsilon(r, \theta), \quad r \in [0, 1], \theta \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.16)$$

5. Suppose that in addition to the assumptions in (4), we know that the points p_i are arranged in concentric regular k -gons that are aligned in the sense that vortices in successive rings are arranged along the same rays emanating from the origin (cf. Figure 2.1). Then we may also arrange that

$$w_p^\varepsilon(r, \frac{\pi j}{k} + \theta) = \overline{w_p^\varepsilon\left(r, \frac{\pi j}{k} - \theta\right)}, \quad \text{for odd } j, \text{ and } 0 \leq \theta \leq \frac{\pi}{k}. \quad (3.17)$$

Since the proof of this Proposition follows the proof of Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 4.4 in [12] rather closely, we only make some comments regarding its proof. The starting point is the function Φ_0 defined in (2.2)-(2.4). Using the Poisson integral formula corresponding to Neumann boundary conditions, we find

$$\Phi_0(z) = \sum_{i=1}^N d_i \log |(b_i - z)(1 - \bar{b}_i z)|.$$

Following Lemma 5.1 of [12], one defines the phase function $\tilde{\chi}$. The function w_p^ε is then defined to be $e(\tilde{\chi})$ away from the vortices, and $\frac{\rho_j}{\varepsilon}e(d_j\Theta_j)$ on vortex balls of radius $O(\varepsilon)$ centered p_j , with (ρ_j, Θ_j) denoting polar coordinates at p_j . The symmetry properties (3.16)-(3.17) arise from symmetry properties of the functions Φ_0 and $\tilde{\chi}$. The proof of the energy estimate (3.15) proceeds exactly as in [12]. Here is a sketch of the proof of the momentum estimate (3.14): Given points $p_1, \dots, p_N$ as in the statement of Proposition 3.4, consider concentric "rings" R_i^ε centered at the origin, of inner and outer radii $|p_i| - 2\varepsilon$ and $|p_i| + 2\varepsilon$ respectively. Using the log bound on Energy (3.15), and the Cauchy Schwarz inequality, it follows that the contribution of these rings to $\mathcal{J}(w_p^\varepsilon) = o_\varepsilon(1)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. On the other hand, in between rings $|w_p^\varepsilon| \equiv 1$, while $w_p^\varepsilon \cdot (y^\perp \cdot \nabla(w_p^\varepsilon)^\perp) = \frac{\partial \tilde{\chi}}{\partial \theta}$, where θ denotes polar angle relative to the usual polar coordinates. The desired estimate follows by noting that if C is any circle centered at the origin, and contained in $\mathbb{D} \setminus \cup_{i=1}^N R_i^\varepsilon$ then $\int_C \frac{\partial \tilde{\chi}}{\partial \theta} = 2\pi d_C$ where d_C is the total degree of vortices contained inside the circle C . One then computes using $\sum d_i = n = km$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(w_p^\varepsilon) &= -\frac{1}{2} \left\{ k\pi - \frac{\pi}{m} (d_1(|p_2|^2 - |p_1|^2) + (d_1 + d_2)(|p_3|^2 - |p_2|^2) + \dots \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (d_1 + \dots + d_{N-1})(|p_N|^2 - |p_{N-1}|^2) + (d_1 + \dots + d_N)(1 - |p_N|^2)) \right\} + o_\varepsilon(1) \\ \Rightarrow \mathcal{J}(w_p^\varepsilon) &= -\frac{\pi}{2} \left\{ k - \frac{n}{m} + \frac{1}{m} (d_1|p_1|^2 + \dots + d_N|p_N|^2) \right\} + o_\varepsilon(1) \\ &= \frac{\pi}{m} \mathcal{J}_0(p, d) + o_\varepsilon(1). \end{aligned}$$

Some remarks concerning this proposition are in order. First, fixing $N, d_1, \dots, d_N$ the map $p \mapsto w_p^\varepsilon : (\mathbb{D}^*)^N \rightarrow H_{g_n}^1(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$ is continuous, where the domain is given the standard Euclidean topology, and the range is given the Sobolev norm topology. Second, we will use this construction in both our approaches: in the first as an admissible competitor, while in the second as initial datum to a heat flow that we will consider there.

3.1 Considerations of Symmetry

As mentioned in the Introduction, symmetry plays a crucial role in the sequel, where we restrict ourselves to the case where the degrees of vortices are all ± 1 . Accordingly, we now analyze the possible numbers of ± 1 degree vortices that a *uniformly rotating* solution to Gross Pitaevskii can have, for fixed boundary condition of the form (1.2).

For a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, suppose that v is a smooth constrained critical point as in the foregoing proposition, with symmetry property given by (3.1)-(3.2) having vortices of degree ± 1 . Suppose v has N_- vortices of degree -1 . Then in order that its total degree is equal to that of the boundary condition ($= n$), v must necessarily have $N_+ := n + N_-$ vortices of degree $+1$. Write $N = n + 2N_-$ for the total number of vortices. Then since the ansatz (3.2) needs to be consistent with the boundary condition (1.2), we know $k|n$. Additionally, it is clear that $k|N_-$ and hence $k|N$. In other words, v has $\frac{N_-}{k}$ rings carrying k vortices of degree -1 each and $\frac{N_+}{k}$ rings containing k degree $+1$ vortices each.

Examples:

- The simplest case is when $n = 1$ and $k = 1$. This corresponds to a single vortex rotating about the origin with angular speed given by (2.12) with $n = 1$.
- Other than this, the case $k = 1$ is not very interesting, so let us suppose $k > 1$. Hence $N_- > 1$. This specifically shows that *centered* configurations (cf. Fig. 3.1) discussed in [8], for instance a -1 vortex at the origin and $n + 1$ vortices of degree $+1$ located at vertices of a regular polygon *cannot* be limiting




Figure 3: An centered configuration. The solid bullet indicates degree $+1$ and the hollow bullets degree -1 . $k = 6, m = 1$. Not to scale.

vortex locations as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ of *uniformly rotating* solutions to (1.1)-(1.2) in the sense of (3.2). However, we do not know if there exist (more general) periodic solutions to (1.1)-(1.2) which as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ converge to such periodic solutions of (PVF).

- Uniformly rotating solutions v that contain only $+1$ vortices, all of whose rings are aligned in the sense of Section 2 (cf. Fig. 2.1) can be constructed via the constrained minimization strategy of the present section. Further admissible configurations have been discussed in Section 2. Finally, if n is a prime integer and v only contains degree $+1$ vortices then the only possible vortex locations for v are at the vertices of a regular n -gon.

It will be convenient for us to introduce a *generating set* for a symmetric configuration of vortices, and we do this next.

Definition 3.5. Let n, k, N be as above and let $\{a_1, \dots, a_N\}$ be a given set of vortices with k -fold symmetry as above. Then a subset $S \subset \{a_1, \dots, a_N\} = \mathbf{a}$ is said to be a *generating set* of $\mathbf{a}$ if, recalling the notation in (1.4), the disjoint union

$$\bigsqcup_{j=0}^{k-1} e\left(\frac{2\pi j}{k}\right) S = \mathbf{a}.$$

Essentially, selecting a generating set for a multi-ring configuration amounts to selecting a representative from each ring. Now, let $N_R = \frac{N}{k}$ denotes the number of rings, and $S = \{a_1, \dots, a_{N_R}\}$ be a generating set. By virtue of the examples above, we assume that $a_j \neq 0$ for any j . For $j = 1, \dots, N_R$ let $\theta_j := \arg a_j$. Then we can make the choice of the generating set so that $\max_{i \neq j} |\theta_i - \theta_j| \leq \frac{2\pi}{k}$. For the rest of the paper, given $\mathbf{a} \in (\mathbb{D}^*)^N$, we will denote by $\hat{\mathbf{a}} \in (\mathbb{D}^*)^{N_R}$ such a choice of generating set.

Remark 3.6. Let $\mathbf{a} \in (\mathbb{D}^*)^N$ have k -fold symmetry, and suppose $d = (d_1, \dots, d_N) \in \{\pm 1\}^N$ has been suitably fixed. Suppose now $(\mathbf{a}, d)$ is a critical point of the modified re-normalized energy $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ introduced in Section 2.2 above. Finally let $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$ be as in the preceding paragraph. Then, as yet another convenient abuse of notation, we will frequently write

$$\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, d) := \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\mathbf{a}, d). \quad (3.18)$$

This notation has to be interpreted with care: given $\hat{\mathbf{a}} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{N_R})$, for each $j = 1, \dots, N_R$, notice that the degrees associated with the points $a_j, a_j e(\frac{2\pi}{k}), \dots, a_j e(\frac{2\pi(k-1)}{k})$ are all the same. Moreover, if S_N is the group of permutations of the set $\{1, \dots, N\}$ and if σ is a permutation which preserves degrees, i.e. for each $r \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, we have $d_r = d_{\sigma(r)}$, then it is easily seen that $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\mathbf{a}, d)$ is invariant under the permutation σ . Put simply, the functional $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ is not affected by re-labeling of the pairs (a_i, d_i) . It is for this reason that the convention (3.18) is meaningful. When the degree of the vortices have been fixed, as remarked earlier, we will on occasion also suppress the dependence of $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ on d from our notation.

3.2 The Jacobian

In this section we would like to collect (without proof) several tools from the analysis of Ginzburg-Landau formulated in the setting of weak Jacobians. This point of view was made concrete in [13] and a convenient source for proofs of these results is [37]. We start by recalling definitions. Given $u \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{R}^2)$ set

$$j(u) := u \times \nabla u := (u \times u_{x_1}, u \times u_{x_2}). \quad (3.19)$$

With this definition we define the weak Jacobian by the formula

$$Ju := \frac{1}{2} \nabla \times j(u) = \frac{1}{2} ((u \times u_{x_2})_{x_1} - (u \times u_{x_1})_{x_2}), \quad (3.20)$$

to be understood in the sense of distributions. In this paper, we will only need to consider Jacobians of smooth functions, and it is useful to note that (3.20) is then equivalent to the pointwise (not merely in the sense of distributions) formulas

$$Ju = \det(\nabla u) = u_{x_1} \times u_{x_2}. \quad (3.21)$$

Some important tools concerning the Jacobian and the Ginzburg Landau energy, are the vortex balls construction, the Jacobian estimate and the compactness theorem. We will also make crucial use of a modification of the Projection Lemma 1.3 from [26]. In the remainder of the section we record these without proof for the convenience of the reader. Since most of these results are valid for a general domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ we will recall them in this generality. We begin by recalling the compactness theorem.

Theorem 3.7 (Compactness Theorem in 2D, [13] Theorem 3.1). *Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and let u^ε be a sequence of smooth functions satisfying*

$$K_\Omega := \sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} \frac{1}{2|\log \varepsilon|} \int_\Omega |\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 + \frac{(1 - |u^\varepsilon|^2)^2}{2\varepsilon^2} dx < \infty. \quad (3.22)$$

Then there exists a sub-sequence $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ and a signed Radon measure J such that Ju^{ε_n} converges to J in the dual $(C^{0,\alpha})^*$ norm for every $\alpha \in (0,1]$. Moreover there exist $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and integers k_i such that

$$J = \pi \sum_i k_i \delta_{a_i}, \quad \text{and } |J|(\Omega) = \pi \sum_i |k_i| \leq K_\Omega. \quad (3.23)$$

Finally if the Ginzburg Landau energy measure μ^ε defined by

$$\mu^\varepsilon(A) := \frac{1}{2|\log \varepsilon|} \int_A |\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 + \frac{(1 - |u^\varepsilon|^2)^2}{2\varepsilon^2} dx, \quad A \subset \Omega \text{ Lebesgue measurable} \quad (3.24)$$

converges weakly to some limit μ then $J \ll \mu$ and $\frac{dJ}{d\mu} \leq 1$ in the μ -almost everywhere sense.

The next crucial theorem we recall is the vortex balls construction, proven independently by Jerrard [16] and Sandier [35]. We state the version in [37].

Theorem 3.8 (Vortex Balls Theorem, [37] Theorem 4.1). *For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ there exists $\varepsilon_0(\alpha)$ such that for any $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ if u satisfies the estimate*

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla |u||^2 + \frac{(1 - |u|^2)^2}{2\varepsilon^2} \leq \varepsilon^{\alpha-1},$$

then the following holds: For any $1 > r > \varepsilon^{\alpha/2}$, there exists a finite collection of disjoint closed balls $\mathcal{B} = \{B_i\}$ such that

- *With $r(B)$ denoting the radius of the ball B ,*

$$\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} r(B) = r.$$

•

$$\{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \varepsilon, ||u(x)| - 1| \geq \varepsilon^{\alpha/4}\} \subset \bigcup_i B_i$$

- *Writing $d_i = \deg(u, \partial B_i)$ if $B_i \subset \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \varepsilon\}$, and $d_i = 0$ otherwise, and $D = \sum_i |d_i|$ we have*

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\bigcup_i B_i} |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{(1 - |u|^2)^2}{2\varepsilon^2} \geq \pi D \left(\log \frac{r}{D\varepsilon} - C \right) \quad (3.25)$$

where C is a universal constant.

- *If in addition $E_\varepsilon(u) \leq \varepsilon^{\alpha-1}$ then*

$$D \leq C \frac{E_\varepsilon(u)}{\alpha |\log \varepsilon|}.$$

We will also need the so-called Jacobian estimate that was proven in Theorem 2.1 of [13]. We state the version presented in [37] Chapter 6 :

Theorem 3.9 (Jacobian Estimate, [37] Chapter 6). *Let $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be of class C^1 . Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a collection of disjoint closed balls with centers a_i and radii r_i such that*

$$\left\{ x \in \Omega, \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \varepsilon, ||u(x)| - 1| \geq \frac{1}{2} \right\} \subset \mathcal{B}.$$

Let $d_i = \deg(u, \partial B(a_i, r_i))$ if $\overline{B(a_i, r_i)} \subset \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \varepsilon\}$ and 0 otherwise. Then, if $\varepsilon, r := \sum r_i < 1$ then there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\left\| Ju - \pi \sum_i d_i \delta_{a_i} \right\|_{(C_c^{0,1}(\Omega))^*} \leq C \max(\varepsilon, r) (1 + E_\varepsilon(u)). \quad (3.26)$$

Moreover, $\|Ju\|_{(C^0(\Omega))^*} \leq CE_\varepsilon(u)$.

Example 3.10. As an illustration on Jacobians, defining $\tilde{w}_\varepsilon : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ by $\tilde{w}_\varepsilon(z) = \tilde{w}_\varepsilon(\rho e(\theta)) := \frac{\rho}{\varepsilon} e(n\theta)$ if $|z| \leq \varepsilon$ and $\tilde{w}_\varepsilon(z) = \tilde{w}_\varepsilon(\rho e(\theta)) := e(n\theta)$ if $\varepsilon \leq |z| \leq 1$, we find, for any test function $\phi = \phi(x, y)$,

$$\langle J\tilde{w}_\varepsilon, \phi \rangle = \int_{|z| \leq \varepsilon} \frac{n}{\varepsilon^2} \phi(x, y) dx dy \rightarrow n\pi\phi(0)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Let us remark that in (3.26), we may replace the dual norm of compactly supported Lipschitz functions by the dual Sobolev space $W^{-1,1}(\Omega)$. This follows by an easy density argument, and we will make use of this observation. In [26] the points a_i as in the last theorem are called the *essential zeroes* of u . We will take this point of view in Section 5, and use an easy modification of the Projection Lemma in [26].

Recall that in Proposition 3.4, given a point $p \in (\mathbb{D}^*)^N$, we have constructed a function w_p^ε satisfying certain estimates. In particular, if $K \subset (\mathbb{D}^*)^N$ is a compact subset, then the association $p \mapsto w_p^\varepsilon$ yields a continuous embedding of K into $H_{g_n}^1$. The Projection Lemma, loosely speaking, serves to provide a continuous approximate inverse to this embedding, by associating to certain sets of functions in $H_{g_n}^1(\mathbb{D})$, sets of points in $(\mathbb{D}^*)^N$ that are close to being their essential zeroes. We now describe a modification to this Lemma that we will need.

Suppose n, N are as in Proposition 3.4. Naturally, we have $n \leq N$, but typically N can be considerably bigger than n and the Projection Lemma as stated in [26] cannot be expected to hold as is. Indeed, given $u \in H_{g_n}^1(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$, we have the easy estimate

$$E_\varepsilon(u) \geq \min_{u \in H_{g_n}^1} E_\varepsilon(u) \geq n\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} - C,$$

where the last inequality follows from [4] and C is independent of ε . Suppose in addition that u satisfies the estimate

$$E_\varepsilon(u) \leq N\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + K.$$

Then, if ε is suitably small, there exists exactly one integer $m \in [n, N]$ such that u belongs the energy band

$$u \in \mathcal{S}_m := \left\{ u \in H_{g_n}^1(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C}) : \left(m - \frac{1}{2} \right) \leq \frac{E_\varepsilon(u)}{\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}} < \left(m + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\}.$$

The next Lemma deals with functions that belong to the class $\mathcal{S}_N$ that in addition satisfy the following assumptions:

(A₁) $|u(x)| \leq 2$ on $\mathbb{D}$ and

(A₂) there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that for any $x_0 \in \{x \in \mathbb{D}, |u(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2}\}$ the set $B_{c_0\varepsilon}(x_0) \subset \{|u(x)| \leq \frac{3}{4}\}$.

We are finally ready to state the modification of the Projection Lemma that we need, but omit a proof since it follows the proof of Lemma 1.3 of [26] rather closely.

Proposition 3.11 (Lemma 1.3 [26]). *Let D be a compact topological submanifold with boundary in $\mathbb{R}^{2N}$, and let $h : D \rightarrow H_{g_n}^1(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$ be a continuous map such that $h(D) \subset \mathcal{S}_N$, and in addition, elements of $h(D)$ satisfy assumptions (A₁) and (A₂) above. Then there exist positive numbers $\lambda = \lambda(c_0, K, C, n, N), \varepsilon_0$ and α_0 and a continuous map $\Pi : h(D) \rightarrow W_\lambda := \{b \in (\mathbb{D}^*)^N : W(b, d) \leq \lambda\}$ when $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. Furthermore, for any $p \in D$, $\Pi(h(p))$ is at most $4\varepsilon^{\alpha_0}$ away from the essential zeroes of $h(p)$.*

4 Periodic Solutions to Gross-Pitaevskii via Constrained Minimization

In this section we will confine our attention to constructing periodic solutions to (1.1) that only carry vortices of degree $+1$, (or -1 but not both) and that follow corresponding solutions to the point vortex flow. Indeed, the strategy in this section is to focus on constrained minimizers of E_ε , which can only possess vortices of one sign.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $p \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume k is a positive integer that divides n . Then constrained smooth critical points of the Ginzburg Landau energy E_ε defined in (1.3) among competitors in the set*

$$\mathcal{A}_p^{n,k} := \{v \in H_{g_n}^1(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C}), v(e(\frac{2\pi}{k})z) = v(z), \mathcal{J}(v) = p\} \quad (4.1)$$

satisfy the elliptic PDE (3.4) with ω_ε arising as a Lagrange multiplier.

Proof. The proof requires computing the first variations $\delta E_\varepsilon(v)$ and $\delta \mathcal{J}(v)$ of the Ginzburg-Landau Energy (1.3) and the constraint $\mathcal{J}$ defined in (3.6) respectively. For any $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ we compute,

$$\delta E_\varepsilon(v)w = \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} E_\varepsilon(v + sw) = \int_{\mathbb{D}} \nabla v \nabla w - \frac{v \cdot w}{\varepsilon^2} (1 - |v|^2),$$

and

$$\delta \mathcal{J}(v)w = \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \mathcal{J}(v + sw) = - \int_{\mathbb{D}} kv \cdot w + \frac{1}{m} w \cdot (y^\perp \nabla) v^\perp dy.$$

By the Lagrange multiplier theorem, there exists $\omega_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ such that constrained critical points v satisfy

$$\delta E_\varepsilon(v)w = \omega_\varepsilon \delta \mathcal{J}(v)w.$$

The result of the proposition follows by integrating by parts once on the left-hand side. We remark that the symmetry conditions in the definition of the admissible class, do not alter the Euler-Lagrange equations, as can be easily checked using the weak formulation. $\square$

Suppose next that k, p are such that the set $\mathcal{A}_p^{n,k} \neq \emptyset$. We next show that the Direct Method in the calculus of variations yields existence of a constrained minimizer of E_ε within this class.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $p \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose k is a divisor of n , and we have that the admissible set $\mathcal{A}_p^{n,k}$ defined in (4.1) is nonempty. Then the PDE (3.4) has a smooth solution in this set.*

Proof. Suppose $\{v_k\}$ is a minimizing sequence in $\mathcal{A}_p^{n,k} \neq \emptyset$. Then, it is clear that $\{v_k\}$ is bounded in H^1 , and hence by Alaoglu's theorem, converges weakly (upon extraction, not denoted) to $v \in H^1(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$. By Rellich's theorem, a subsequence of $\{v_k\}$ (not relabeled) converges strongly in L^2 to v . Using standard facts from weak convergence, we conclude that $\mathcal{J}(v_k) \rightarrow \mathcal{J}(v) = p$. Finally, by Mazur's theorem, v has the same boundary conditions as v_k ; and furthermore, inherits the symmetry property of v_k . Thus v is a constrained minimizer of the Ginzburg Landau energy, with $\mathcal{J}(v) = p$. By standard elliptic regularity, v is smooth upto the boundary. Consequently, by Proposition 4.1, the desired conclusion follows. $\square$

We will first study single ring vortex polygons and obtain time periodic solutions to Gross Pitaevskii that follow these solutions to (PVF). The case of multiple ring solutions is harder via constrained minimization, and we are only able to show the existence of multiple ring time periodic solutions to (1.1), and are unable to show that these follow corresponding relative equilibria to (PVF). We describe this (partial) result towards the end of this section.

4.1 Single Ring Solutions

Given a vortex polygon as in (2.12) above, we now construct a sequence of solutions v_ε to (3.4) for $\varepsilon > 0$ small, whose vortices follow this vortex polygon as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We note that for such single ring solutions we use $m = 1$, i.e. $k = n$ in the definition of $\mathcal{J}$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $p \in (-\frac{n}{2}, 0)$. There exist a sequence of constraint values $p_\varepsilon \rightarrow \pi p$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and a corresponding sequence of constrained minimizers v_ε of E_ε within the class $\mathcal{A}_{p_\varepsilon}^{n,k}$ satisfying*

$$E_\varepsilon(v_\varepsilon) \leq n\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + O_\varepsilon(1) \quad (4.2)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Fix $p \in (-\frac{n}{2}, 0)$, and select $r \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\frac{nr^2}{2} = -p.$$

Define then points $b_j = re(\frac{2\pi j}{n})$, and write $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$. Recall from (2.9) that

$$\mathcal{J}_0(b, d) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n |b_i|^2 = -n \frac{r^2}{2} = p.$$

Let $\tilde{v}_\varepsilon$ be a function as in Proposition 3.4, satisfying

$$E_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon) = n \left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma \right) + W(b) + o_\varepsilon(1), \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$|\mathcal{J}(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon) - \pi p| = o_\varepsilon(1) \quad (4.4)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Define

$$p_\varepsilon = \mathcal{J}(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon).$$

Then $\tilde{v}_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{A}_{p_\varepsilon}^{n,n}$, so the latter is not the empty set. Consequently, by Proposition 4.2, we conclude that there exists a smooth minimizer v_ε with $\mathcal{J}(v_\varepsilon) = p_\varepsilon$, and by comparison with the energy of $\tilde{v}_\varepsilon$, we have (4.2). $\square$

We are now ready for the main result of this section. This uses in a crucial way the vortex balls construction (cf. Theorem 3.8).

Theorem 4.4. *Let $b(t)$ be a single vortex polygon solution to (2.13) in the unit disc, with vortices located on a circle C of radius ρ , related to the angular speed ω_0 of the flow by (2.12). Then for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a solution $u_\varepsilon(t, x) = R(-n\omega_\varepsilon t)v_\varepsilon(R(\omega_\varepsilon t)x)$ (cf. (3.2)). Furthermore, there exist a finite collection of disjoint balls $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$ in $\mathbb{D}$ including n balls $B^j := e(\frac{2\pi j}{d})B_{r_\varepsilon}^0$ for $j = 0, \dots, n-1$ such that*

1. u_ε satisfies

$$u_\varepsilon(r, \theta + \frac{2\pi}{n}, t) = u_\varepsilon(r, \theta, t)$$

for all time $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and satisfies the energy estimate $E_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \leq \pi n |\log \varepsilon| + O_\varepsilon(1)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$,

2. u_ε is time periodic with period $T_\varepsilon = \frac{2\pi}{\omega_\varepsilon}$.
3. The radii r_ε converge to 0 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$,
4. Outside the collection $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$, we have that $|u_\varepsilon| > 1/2$, and so $\deg(u_\varepsilon, \partial B)$ is well defined for each ball $B \in \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$. Moreover, $\deg(u_\varepsilon, \partial B^j) = 1$, and $\deg(u_\varepsilon, \partial B) = 0$ for any $B \in \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon \setminus \bigcup_j B^j$,
5. $|\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon| = o_\varepsilon(1)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.
6. The common circular orbit C^ε associated with the rotation of the centers of the balls B^j approaches C as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Let $b(t)$ be a vortex polygon solution to (2.8). Then $b(t) = (b_0(t), b_1(t), \dots, b_n(t))$, where $b_j(t) = re(-\omega_0 t) e(\frac{2\pi j}{n})$, and r and ω_0 are related by (2.12). Set $p = -\frac{nr^2}{2}$. Then by Proposition 4.3, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist a sequence of solutions v_ε to (3.4) satisfying the bound

$$E_\varepsilon(v_\varepsilon) \leq n\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + O_\varepsilon(1),$$

and

$$|\mathcal{J}(v_\varepsilon) - \pi p| = o_\varepsilon(1)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Setting $u_\varepsilon(t, x) = R(-n\omega_\varepsilon t)v_\varepsilon(R(\omega_\varepsilon t)x)$ proves items (1) and (2). The energy bound above permits us to invoke the vortex balls Theorem 3.8, which when applied to v_ε with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, implies that there exist a finite collection of disjoint closed balls $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon = \{B_j^\varepsilon\}_{j=1}^{N_\varepsilon}$ with $\sum_{j=1}^{N_\varepsilon} r_j^\varepsilon \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/4}$, where r_j^ε is the radius of the ball B_j^ε , and

$$\{x \in \mathbb{D} : ||v_\varepsilon(x)| - 1| \geq \varepsilon^{1/8}\} \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{N_\varepsilon} B_j^\varepsilon.$$

This implies items (3) and (5), and also that $|v_\varepsilon| > 1/2$ outside the collection $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$. Set $D_\varepsilon = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\varepsilon} |d_j^\varepsilon|$, with d_j^ε as in the statement of Theorem 3.8. Then $D_\varepsilon > 0$, and $d_j^\varepsilon \equiv +1$. The proof of this fact uses the observation if $D_\varepsilon = 0$ for some ε , then the momentum $\mathcal{J}(v_\varepsilon)$ is forced to be vanishingly small, while if $d_j^\varepsilon \neq +1$ for some j , then the Ginzburg-Landau energy E_ε is too big. Since the details are very similar to Theorem 4.5 of [12] we omit them here. In fact, that combined with the lower energy bound (3.25) and the symmetry of v_ε shows item (4) is true. It remains to show (6). Denote the centers of the balls B^j mentioned in the statement of the Theorem by a_ε^j . Then, similar to the proof of (3.14) in Proposition 3.4 we can argue that $\mathcal{J}(v_\varepsilon) = -\frac{n\pi}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n |a_\varepsilon^j|^2 + o_\varepsilon(1)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. But since $\mathcal{J}(v_\varepsilon) = p_\varepsilon = \pi p + o_\varepsilon(1)$, and since $|a_\varepsilon^j| = |a_\varepsilon^0|$ for all j , it follows that $|a_\varepsilon^j - re(\frac{2\pi j}{n})| = o_\varepsilon(1)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. This completes the proof of item (6). $\square$

It is natural to hope to be able to relate the speeds ω_ε of the time periodic solutions v_ε to (1.1) that we have constructed, to the speed ω_0 of (PVF) given by (2.12). This seems to require (and in fact, to be equivalent to) a bound on the potential term of the form

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \int_{\mathbb{D}} (1 - |v_\varepsilon|^2)^2 \leq C.$$

The general starting point for an estimate like this is a Pohazaeu identity, cf. Lemma 5.7 below. However, in the present case, this approach fails since we do not have control on ω_ε independent of ε .

4.2 Remarks on Multiple Ring Solutions

In this section, we briefly show existence of solutions to Gross Pitaevskii that have multiple rings of $+1$ vortices that are aligned. Regrettably however, we are as yet unable to relate these solutions to corresponding solutions of point vortex flow in a very concrete manner. The difficulty is the same as earlier: we do not have the much-sought after uniform bound on the potential term.

Once again, let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ denote a relative equilibrium with $d_i \equiv 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let $k|n$ and suppose the $a_1, \dots, a_n$ are arranged in $\frac{n}{k}$ rings of radii $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{n/k}$ respectively, each containing k vortices each. Suppose further that the rings are aligned. Thus

$$\mathcal{J}_0(a_1, \dots, a_n) = -\frac{k}{2}(\rho_1^2 + \dots + \rho_{n/k}^2).$$

The strategy is to find constrained minimizers of $E_\varepsilon(u)$ within the admissible set with further symmetry assumptions that ensure that the rings are aligned. Specifically, define

$$\mathfrak{B}_p^{n,k} := \left\{ u \in H_{g_n}^1(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C}) \mid \begin{array}{ll} u(r, \theta + \frac{2\pi}{k}) &= u(r, \theta), 0 \leq r \leq 1, \theta \in [0, 2\pi) \\ u(r, \frac{\pi j}{k} + \theta) &= \bar{u}(r, \frac{\pi j}{k} - \theta), j \text{ odd}, \theta \in [0, \frac{\pi}{k}] \end{array} \right\}. \quad (4.5)$$

As will be clear from the next section, these symmetry conditions correspond to specifying classes of functions whose Fourier coefficients satisfy certain relations. Furthermore, it can also be checked easily that the constraints imposed above do not alter the Euler Lagrange equation (3.4). We then note that Proposition 4.2 applies and yields a smooth constrained minimizer for constraint values p such that $\mathfrak{B}_p^{n,k} \neq \emptyset$. Then, given $p \in (-\frac{n}{2}, 0)$, we fix a solution to (PVF) with this p -value, noting that such solutions are not necessarily unique. Proceeding as in Proposition 4.3, we obtain a sequence $p_\varepsilon \rightarrow p$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and corresponding sequence of constrained minimizers $v_\varepsilon \in \mathfrak{B}_{p_\varepsilon}^{n,k}$ satisfying an energy bound

$$E_\varepsilon(v_\varepsilon) \leq n\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + O_\varepsilon(1)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. However, contrary to the single ring case, we can *not* obtain any connection between vortex locations of v_ε and those corresponding to solutions of (PVF). Indeed, in the single ring case, if ϱ is the radius of the ring, then prescribing a constraint value for $\mathcal{J}_0(b) = -\frac{\varrho^2}{2}$, fixes ϱ . In the case of multiple rings on the other hand, a condition of the form

$$\varrho_1^2 + \dots + \varrho_{n/k}^2 = p$$

does not suffice to determine $\varrho_1, \dots, \varrho_{n/k}$. Nevertheless, using the vortex balls theorem and the Jacobian estimate, we *can* argue that $Jv_\varepsilon \rightarrow \pi \sum_{i=1}^n d_i \delta_{c_i}$ for points $c_i \in \mathbb{D}$ that have the same symmetry properties as the $\{a_i\}$. Regrettably, what we *cannot* argue, is that the collection of points $\{c_i\}$ is the same as the collection $\{a_i\}$ or even that it is a relative equilibrium of (PVF).

5 Periodic Solutions to Gross-Pitaevskii via Linking

In this section, we expand on the results of the preceding section, using a completely different approach. Given a relative equilibrium for the point vortex flow with time period T , for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, we construct periodic solutions to the Gross Pitaevskii equation that have the *same time period* T , and follow the given relative equilibrium to point vortex flow as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The crucial advantage of the approach of the present section,

in comparison to that of the previous section is that we are able to construct periodic solutions to Gross Pitaevskii in which vortices of degrees $+1$ and -1 *co-exist for all time*. As far as we are aware, in the presence of a Dirichlet boundary condition, such solutions to Gross Pitaevskii in which vortices of opposite degree co-exist for all time without succumbing to *vortex annihilation*, are new. The approach of this section also permits the analysis of multi-ring solutions.

We present the results of this section in two main theorems, viz. Theorems 5.1 and 5.6. Theorem 5.1 concerns itself with existence of periodic solutions to Gross Pitaevskii for sufficiently small ε . Existence is proved by adapting a localized topological linking argument of [26] to find critical points of the functional $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}$, where ω_0 is related to the time-period of rotation of the given relative equilibrium of (PVF) via formula (2.21). In the second main Theorem 5.6 we study asymptotics as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ of the time periodic solutions constructed in Theorem 5.1.

To fix ideas, suppose that $(\mathbf{a}, d)$ is a relative equilibrium to (PVF) corresponding to a solution $\mathbf{a}(t)$ of the system (2.8), cf. (2.11). Here $\mathbf{a}(t) = (a_1(t), \dots, a_N(t))$, and $d = (d_1, \dots, d_N)$ where $d_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ are the associated degrees. Let $n = \sum_{i=1}^N d_i$ be the total degree. We suppose that N_- denotes the number of -1 vortices, so that the number of $+1$ vortices is $n + N_-$ and the total number of vortices $N = n + 2N_-$. Let k be a divisor of n , and suppose the group of rotations by an angle $\frac{2\pi}{k}$ acts on the points $\mathbf{a}$, preserving degree. Then necessarily N_- is a multiple of k , and consequently so is the total number of vortices N . This means that the vortices are arranged in $N_R := \frac{N}{k}$ rings, with $\frac{N_-}{k}$ of them containing k vortices each of degree -1 and the remaining rings each containing k degree $+1$ vortices. Recall then from Section 2.2 that $\mathbf{a}$ is a critical point of $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ defined in Eq. (2.20). Recall that $m = \frac{n}{k}$. Through the course of the proofs of Theorems 5.1 and 5.6 we make the following

Assumption A:

By rotational invariance of the functional $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$, it follows that for every $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ the point $(e(\theta)\mathbf{a}, d)$ is critical for the functional $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$. We introduce the smooth curve in $\mathbb{R}^{2N_R}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}} := \{e(\theta)\hat{\mathbf{a}} : 0 \leq \theta < 2\pi\}.$$

It is then clear that a tangent vector to $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ is a null-vector for $D^2\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$. We will assume that this is the only null-direction.

We believe that this assumption is automatically satisfied for the critical points constructed in Section 2. Verification of such an assumption would require computing with the Hessian $D^2\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ – a task that we have not strenuously undertaken since this assumption can be substantially relaxed; we explain this along with necessary modifications to the proofs of Theorems 5.1-5.6 in Remark 5.8 below. However, in an attempt to highlight the variational aspects of the proofs and for the sake of clarity, we present the proofs of our Theorems under Assumption A.

For the rest of the section, we will mainly be dealing with a generator of the critical point of $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ that we have fixed. Denote it by $\{a_1, \dots, a_{n_R}\}$. The reader might find it helpful to revisit our conventions on notation from Remarks 3.6 and from the end of Section 2.2. We now state our first main theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $(\mathbf{a}(t), d)$ be a time periodic solution to the point vortex flow (2.8) with time period $T = \frac{2\pi m}{\omega_0}$, cf. Eq. (2.21). Denote by $(\mathbf{a}, d)$ the corresponding critical point to the functional $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ defined in (2.20). Let further $\mathbf{a}$ satisfy Assumption A above. Then there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ depending only on n and the critical point $\mathbf{a}$ such that the following holds: for all $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ there exists a time periodic solution $u_\varepsilon(x, t) :=$*

$R(-k\omega_0 t)v_\varepsilon(R(\frac{\omega_0}{m}t)x)$ of (1.1) of time period T , satisfying

$$u_\varepsilon(x; t) = u_\varepsilon(r, \theta; t) = u_\varepsilon\left(r, \theta + \frac{2\pi}{k}; t\right) \quad (5.1)$$

for all $r \in (0, 1]$, $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, the function $v_\varepsilon = v_\varepsilon(y) : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is a smooth critical point of the functional $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}$ defined in (3.7), has the k -fold symmetry property (3.3), and satisfies the energy estimate

$$\left| \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(v_\varepsilon) - N \left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma \right) - \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\mathbf{a}) \right| = o_\varepsilon(1), \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad (5.2)$$

where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ is a universal constant defined below in (5.8).

Remark 5.2. We will prove that the time periodic solutions constructed in Theorem 5.1 do indeed follow the given solution of (PVF) in Theorem 5.6.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. The proof of this theorem is organized in a sequence of steps. Our goal in much of the proof is to build a critical point of $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}$ introduced in (3.7).

Step 1: Let us begin by localizing near a critical point of $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$. Let $\mathbf{a} := (a_1, \dots, a_N)$ be a critical point of $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ corresponding to the given periodic solution of (2.8) with degrees $d_1, \dots, d_N$. Then, as remarked before, for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, we have the invariance

$$\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(a_1, \dots, a_N, d_1, \dots, d_N) = \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(a_1 e(\theta), \dots, a_N e(\theta), d_1, \dots, d_N).$$

Let k be a divisor of n , and suppose that the given configuration of vortices has k -fold symmetry. Let $\hat{\mathbf{a}} = (a_1, \dots, a_{N_R})$ be a generating set for this critical point, chosen as in Definition 3.5.

Taking into account the rotational invariance of the functional $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ described above, recall the set $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ defined in Assumption A above. Topologically, this set is a circle. Geometrically, $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ is a simple closed smooth curve in the *phase space* $(\mathbb{D}^*)^{N_R}$. Let us emphasize that $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ is *not* the product of circles of radii $|a_1|, \dots, |a_{N_R}|$ in $\mathbb{D}$, with $\mathbb{D}$ being the *physical space* for the problem (2.8). Finally, points in $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ will be denoted with a hat, for instance $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$, to remain consistent with Remark 3.6.

It then follows that the circle $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ is critical for $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ in the sense that for any $\hat{\mathbf{b}} \in \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$, the corresponding point $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ is critical for $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$. It follows that for each $\hat{\mathbf{b}} \in \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$, the real Hessian $D^2 \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, d)$ identified with a *real* $2N_R \times 2N_R$ matrix has $2N_R$ real eigenvalues and corresponding eigenvectors $(e_1)_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}, \dots, (e_{2N_R})_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}$ that are mutually ortho-normal. When there is no confusion, we will drop the subscript $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ from the eigenvectors in the interest of clarity.

Given a point $\hat{\mathbf{b}} \in \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$, owing to the degeneracy discussed above, cf. Assumption A, the unit tangent vector to $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ at $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ is a null-eigenvector of $D^2 \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$. Fixing an orientation for the curve $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$, we may, with no loss of generality, assume that $(e_1)_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}$ is the unit tangent vector to $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ that is consistent with the orientation. For any $\delta > 0$, we introduce the δ -neighborhood of $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta := \{\hat{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N_R} : \text{dist}(\hat{\mathbf{p}}, \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}) < \delta\}.$$

We will be interested in sets $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$ for suitably small $\delta > 0$, and we will make this precise shortly. However, before doing so, let us remark that for such δ , we will continue to denote points of the set $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$ *with hats*, for instance $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$. This is done as a reminder that $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\hat{\mathbf{p}}, d)$ should be interpreted in the sense of Remark 3.6.

We will be interested in sets $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$ where δ is sufficiently small so that the following hold, see figure 4 below:




Figure 4: A Schematic Picture of a Tubular Neighborhood $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta \subset (\mathbb{D}^*)^{N_R}$. The curve along the center line denotes the critical curve $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$. Also indicated is the orthogonal plane π_θ , at $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_\theta \in \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$. Its intersection π_θ^δ with $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$ is not labeled in the figure.

- The closure $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta}$ is contained strictly in $(\mathbb{D}^*)^{N_R}$.
- The neighborhood $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$ admits the following system of local coordinates $(y_1, \dots, y_{2N_R})$ defined using $(e_1, \dots, e_{2N_R})$ introduced above: given a point $\hat{\mathbf{p}} \in \overline{\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta}$, for $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, there exists a *unique* point $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_\theta := e(\theta)\hat{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ which is closest to $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$. Set $y_1(\hat{\mathbf{p}}) = \theta$. Next, denote by π_θ the $2N_R - 1$ dimensional plane passing through $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_\theta$ and normal $(e_1)_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_\theta}$. Then for δ as above, each point $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \in \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$ verifying $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \in \pi_\theta$ has first component $y_1(\hat{\mathbf{q}}) = \theta$. Write $\pi_\theta^\delta := \pi_\theta \cap \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$ for the $2N_R - 1$ dimensional disc in the plane π_θ of radius δ . Then naturally, π_θ^δ has an orthonormal system of coordinates given by $(e_2)_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_\theta}, \dots, (e_{2N_R-1})_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_\theta}$. Furthermore, since for $\delta > 0$, any point in $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \in \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$ belongs to one and only one π_θ^δ , we will write $\hat{\mathbf{q}} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{2N_R})$ where $y_1(\hat{\mathbf{q}}) = \theta$ is as defined before and the coordinates $(y_2, \dots, y_{2N_R})$ are the coordinates of $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \in \pi_\theta^\delta$ in the basis described above. Note that by compactness and smoothness of the curve $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$, this system of coordinates is well-defined for all δ sufficiently small, say $0 < \delta \leq \delta_*$. See Figure 4.

Let d be fixed as in the statement of the theorem so that we may frequently suppress it from our notations. Given local coordinates as in the preceding paragraph, by Assumption A there exist real numbers $\lambda_1 = 0$ and

$\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2N_R} > 0$, and a positive integer $1 \leq S \leq 2N_R$ such that for any $\hat{\mathbf{p}} = (y_1, \dots, y_{2N_R}) \in \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$, we may write

$$\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\hat{\mathbf{p}}) - \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}) = - \sum_{i=1}^S \lambda_i y_i^2 + \sum_{i=S+1}^{2N_R} \lambda_i y_i^2 + o(\text{dist}(\hat{\mathbf{p}}, \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}})^2). \quad (5.3)$$

The case $S = 1$ corresponds to a degenerate local minimum of the functional $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ whereas the case $S = 2N_R$ corresponds to a degenerate local maximum. Intermediate values of S correspond to degenerate saddle points of $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$. We will deal with the three cases individually. Given the coordinates described above, let Π_1 denote projection of a point to its first coordinate.

Step 2: In this step, we introduce the linking structure that will be used in case $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$ is a saddle point, i.e. $2 \leq S \leq 2N_R - 1$. Given $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, set

$$B_\theta := \{\hat{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta : \Pi_1(\hat{\mathbf{y}}) = \theta\}.$$

We remark that the sets B_θ and the set π_θ^δ from Step 1 above are the same, but we prefer to use the more suggestive notation B_θ which also suppresses the dependence on δ . Now, write

$$\begin{aligned} D_\theta &:= \{\hat{\mathbf{y}} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{2N_R}) \in B_\theta : y_{S+1} = y_{S+2} = \dots = y_{2N_R} = 0\}, \\ D_\theta^\perp &:= \{\hat{\mathbf{y}} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{2N_R}) \in B_\theta : y_2 = \dots = y_S = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$\delta_1 := \min \left\{ \min_{\hat{\mathbf{y}} \in \partial D_\theta} \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(e(\theta)\hat{\mathbf{a}}) - \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}), \min_{\hat{\mathbf{y}} \in \partial D_\theta^\perp} \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}) - \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(e(\theta)\hat{\mathbf{a}}) \right\} \quad (5.4)$$

By possibly reducing the value of $\delta_* > 0$, we may assume that $\delta_1 > 0$.

Claim 5.3. *The sets ∂D_θ and $D_\theta^\perp$ are homotopically linked in B_θ^δ .*

Proof of Claim 5.3. We notice that $\partial D_\theta \cap D_\theta^\perp = \emptyset$. Let Π_θ denote the projection map from B_θ onto D_θ . We must show that for any $h \in C(D_\theta, B_\theta)$ that satisfies $h|_{\partial D_\theta} = \text{id}|_{\partial D_\theta}$ one has that $h(D_\theta) \cap D_\theta^\perp \neq \emptyset$. Note, by the definition of our sets ∂D_θ and $D_\theta^\perp$, this is equivalent to solving the equation

$$\Pi_\theta \circ h(d) = 0, \quad d \in D_\theta.$$

To achieve this, it suffices to show that

$$\deg(\Pi_\theta \circ h, \partial D_\theta, 0) \text{ is well defined and is different from } 0.$$

Define a one parameter family of maps $h_t : \overline{D_\theta} \rightarrow B_\theta$ by

$$h_t = (1 - t)\text{id} + th.$$

It follows that $h_t|_{\partial D_\theta} = \text{id}|_{\partial D_\theta}$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$. Consequently,

$$\deg(\Pi_\theta \circ h_t, \partial D_\theta, 0) \text{ is well defined.}$$

By homotopy invariance of the Brouwer degree, the proof of the Claim follows since $\deg(\text{id}, \partial D_\theta, 0) = 1$. $\square$

In fact, defining the sets

$$\begin{aligned} D &:= \{\widehat{\mathbf{p}} = (y_1, \dots, y_{2N_R}) \in \mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta : y_{S+1} = \dots = y_{2N_R} = 0, \text{dist}(\widehat{\mathbf{p}}, \mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\mathbf{a}}}) < \delta\}, \\ \partial D &:= \{\widehat{\mathbf{p}} = (y_1, \dots, y_{2N_R}) \in \mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta : y_{S+1} = \dots = y_{2N_R} = 0, \text{dist}(\widehat{\mathbf{p}}, \mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\mathbf{a}}}) = \delta\}, \\ D^\perp &:= \{\widehat{\mathbf{p}} = (y_1, \dots, y_{2N_R}) \in \mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta : y_2 = \dots = y_S = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

then the proof of Claim 5.3 shows that ∂D and $D^\perp$ are homotopically linked in $\mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$.

Step 3: In this step, we construct a gradient flow that will be used to continuously deform the linked sets from Step 2, in a manner that preserves the linking structure. Our desired critical point v_ε , as in the statement of the Theorem, will arise as the large time limit of this flow. Before describing the flow, we construct well prepared initial data, and embed the linking structure from the preceding step into the Sobolev space H^1 . Given $\widehat{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$, let $\mathbf{p} \in (\mathbb{D}^*)^N$ be the associated symmetric configuration of vortices as explained in Definition 3.5. Then let $w_{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}}^\varepsilon \in H_{g_n}^1(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$ denote the map constructed in Proposition 3.4 satisfying the following properties:

- One has $w_{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}}^\varepsilon \in C(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \cap H_{g_n}^1(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$.
- One has $|w_{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}}^\varepsilon(x)| \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{D}$ and $w_{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}}^\varepsilon(x) = 0$ if and only if $x = p_j, j = 1, \dots, N$.
- The Ginzburg-Landau energy $E_\varepsilon(w_{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}}^\varepsilon)$ satisfies

$$E_\varepsilon(w_{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}}^\varepsilon) = N \left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma \right) + W(\mathbf{p}, d) + o_\varepsilon(1) \quad (5.5)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ is a universal constant that we recall below.

- The momentum $\mathcal{J}(w_{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}}^\varepsilon)$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{J}(w_{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}}^\varepsilon) = \frac{\pi}{m} \mathcal{J}_0(\mathbf{p}, d) + o_\varepsilon(1) \quad (5.6)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

- Finally one has the symmetry condition

$$w_{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}}^\varepsilon \left(r, \theta + \frac{2\pi}{k} \right) = w_{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}}^\varepsilon(r, \theta). \quad (5.7)$$

We briefly digress to recall the definition and some properties of the universal constant γ from (5.5).

Given $\varepsilon > 0$ and $R > 0$ recall the quantity $I(\varepsilon, R)$ defined in [4], Chapter III:

$$I(\varepsilon, R) := \min_{u \in H_g^1(B_R(0))} \left\{ \int_{B_R(0)} \frac{|\nabla u|^2}{2} + \frac{(1 - |u|^2)^2}{4\varepsilon^2} dx : g(x) = \frac{x}{|x|} \right\}.$$

Furthermore set $I(t) := I(t, 1)$ for $t > 0$. Then by [4] Lemma III.1, the function $t \mapsto I(t) + \pi \log t$ is non-decreasing for $t \in (0, 1)$. Finally, recall from [4], Lemma IX.I that the limit

$$\gamma := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} (I(t) + \pi \log t) \quad (5.8)$$

exists finitely.

We now return to the main goal of Step 3, namely construction of a gradient flow. For any $\widehat{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathbb{D}$, let $u^\varepsilon = u^\varepsilon(x, t; \widehat{\mathbf{p}})$ denote the unique smooth solution to the initial boundary value problem

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \Delta u + \frac{u(1 - |u|^2)}{\varepsilon^2} - \omega_0 \left(ku + \frac{1}{m}(y^\perp \cdot \nabla)u^\perp \right), \quad x \in \mathbb{D}, t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad (5.9)$$

$$u(x, 0; \widehat{\mathbf{p}}) = w_{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}}^\varepsilon(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{D}, \quad (5.10)$$

$$u(x, t; \widehat{\mathbf{p}}) = g_n(x), \quad x \in \partial\mathbb{D}, t \in \mathbb{R}_+. \quad (5.11)$$

Let us point out that the system (5.9)-(5.11) is the gradient flow of $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}$. Global existence and regularity for this system follows from a parabolic analogue of Lemma 3.3 and standard theory for reaction diffusion systems, see for instance [46], pg. 210. Furthermore, for each fixed time $t \geq 0$, the map $\widehat{\mathbf{p}} \mapsto u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t; \widehat{\mathbf{p}}) \in H_{g_n}^1(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$ is continuous, where the target space is given the norm topology. We also have the following Claim which asserts that the heat flow described above preserves symmetry of the initial configuration of vortices.

Claim 5.4. *Let $\widehat{\mathbf{p}} \in D$, and $\varepsilon > 0$ be fixed. Then the solution u^ε to the system (5.9)-(5.11) satisfies*

$$u^\varepsilon \left(r, \theta + \frac{2\pi}{k}, t; \widehat{\mathbf{p}} \right) = u^\varepsilon(r, \theta, t; \widehat{\mathbf{p}}), \quad (5.12)$$

for every $r \in (0, 1], \theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, and $t \geq 0$.

Proof of Claim 5.4. We start by noting that a function $U \in H^1(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$ which satisfies a symmetry property $U(r, \theta + \frac{2\pi}{k}) = U(r, \theta)$ has a Fourier series development

$$U(r, \theta) \sim \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}, k|j} c_j(r) e(j\theta).$$

In other words, Fourier coefficients corresponding to frequencies that are not multiples of k are absent. In the case at hand, we can develop the solution in Fourier series

$$u_\varepsilon(r, \theta, t; \widehat{\mathbf{p}}) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} c_j(r, t) e(j\theta), \quad (5.13)$$

where we suppress the dependence of the Fourier coefficients on ε and on $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}$. Also, the initial condition $w_{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}}^\varepsilon$ satisfies symmetry property (5.7). Consequently it admits a Fourier series development

$$w_{\widehat{\mathbf{p}}}^\varepsilon(r, \theta) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}, k|j} \mathbf{c}_j(r) e(j\theta). \quad (5.14)$$

For convenience, set $\mathbf{c}_j = 0$ if j is not a multiple of k . Since u_ε satisfies the parabolic PDE (5.9), we get the following system of partial differential equations for the Fourier coefficients.

$$\frac{\partial c_j(r, t)}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial^2 c_j}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial r} - \frac{j^2}{r^2} c_j + \frac{c_j}{\varepsilon^2} - \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \sum_{p, q, m \in \mathbb{Z}: p-q+m=j} c_p \bar{c}_q c_m - \omega_0 \left(k - \frac{j}{m} \right) c_j(r), \quad 0 < r < 1, t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad (5.15)$$

$$c_j(1, t) = \delta_{jn} \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

$$c_j(r, 0) = \mathbf{c}_j(r), \quad 0 < r \leq 1.$$

The above system holds for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, and as usual δ_{jn} denotes Kronecker's delta symbol. When j is not a multiple of k , one has 0 boundary and initial conditions for c_j ; furthermore for such j , if $p - q + m = j$ for integers p, q, m then k does not divide at least one of p, q or m . Consequently, by uniqueness $c_j \equiv 0$ is the only solution for j that are not a multiple of k . This completes the proof of Claim 5.4 and Step 3. $\square$

Step 4: In this step we deal with the case that $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$ is a degenerate local minimum of $\mathcal{H}^{n,\omega_0}$, i.e. $S = 1$ in (5.3). Note first that in this case, necessarily the degrees of the vortices are all $+1$ and so $N = n > 0$: this is because, in the presence of a pair vortices of opposite degrees ± 1 , any small change in vortex locations that reduces the distance between this pair of vortices keeping the other vortices fixed, reduces the energy $\mathcal{H}^{n,\omega_0}$.

We consider the gradient flow system (5.9)-(5.11) with initial data $w^\varepsilon(x) := w_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\varepsilon(x)$ and denote the resulting solution by $u^\varepsilon(x, t)$. In particular, note that for the sake of simplicity, throughout Step 4, we do not indicate the dependence of $u^\varepsilon(x, t; \hat{\mathbf{a}})$ on $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$. Set

$$\alpha := \frac{1}{4n+4} \min\{\delta_*, |a_j - a_i|, i \neq j \in 1, \dots, n\}.$$

Recall here that $\delta_* > 0$ was introduced in Step 2 above. Set

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{a}} := \{e(\theta)\mathbf{a} : 0 \leq \theta < 2\pi\},$$

and $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{a}}^\alpha$ to be the α -neighborhood of $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{a}}$ defined similar to $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a}}^\delta$ from Step 1. We remark that we are using $\mathcal{K}$ for neighborhood sets in $(\mathbb{D}^*)^N$ and $\mathcal{L}$ for neighborhood sets in $(\mathbb{D}^*)^{N_R}$. The main claim of this step is:

Claim 5.5. *Define the set*

$$G_\varepsilon(t) := \left\{x \in \mathbb{D} : |u_\varepsilon(x, t)| \leq \frac{1}{2}\right\}.$$

Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small and any $t \geq 0$, if $x_\varepsilon \in G_\varepsilon(t)$, then

$$\min_{j=1, \dots, n} \left[\min_{\theta \in [0, 2\pi)} \text{dist}(x_\varepsilon, a_j e(\theta)) \right] < \alpha. \quad (5.16)$$

Sketch of the Proof of Claim 5.5. The proof of this Claim follows very closely the proof of Theorem A of [27]. We recall the main ideas for the convenience of the reader. Suppose by way of contradiction, there exists a first positive time $T_\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ such that (5.16) fails. In other words, there exists a point $x_1^\varepsilon \in \mathbb{D}$, a critical point $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{a}}$, and points $(x_j^\varepsilon)_{j=2}^n \in \mathbb{D}$ and such that, without loss of generality,

$$\begin{aligned} |x_1^\varepsilon - a_1| &= \alpha, & |u_\varepsilon(x_1^\varepsilon, T_\varepsilon)| &\leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ |x_j^\varepsilon - a_j| &\leq \alpha, & |u_\varepsilon(x_j^\varepsilon, T_\varepsilon)| &\leq \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad j = 2, 3, \dots, n. \quad (5.17)$$

Indeed, the point x_1^ε and a_1 such that $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{a}}$ are obtained from the contradiction hypothesis, and subsequently, we choose the points $(x_j^\varepsilon)_{j=2}^n$ to satisfy the above conditions. Note that by virtue of the symmetry Claim 5.4, we may assume that the points (x_j^ε) satisfy the k -fold symmetry property.

Set $\mu := \frac{1}{16n+1}$, and $V_\varepsilon(x) := u_\varepsilon(x, T_\varepsilon)$. We will also find it convenient to use the notation

$$\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(w, A) := \int_A \frac{1}{2} |\nabla w|^2 + \frac{(1 - |w|^2)^2}{4\varepsilon^2} dy + \frac{\omega_0}{2} \int_A k|w|^2 + \frac{1}{m} w \cdot (y^\perp \cdot \nabla) w^\perp dy,$$

for all $w \in H_{g_n}^1(\mathbb{D})$ having the k -fold symmetry property, where $A \subset \mathbb{D}$ is any Lebesgue measurable set. We will also use similar notation for the functionals E_ε and $\mathcal{J}$.

By Fubini's theorem, the energy decreasing property of the gradient flow, and the $\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ upper bound on the initial data, it can be easily seen that, for each $j = 1, \dots, n$, there exists $\mu_j \in [\mu, 2\mu]$ and a positive number $C(\mu)$ satisfying the estimate

$$\varepsilon^{\mu_j} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(V_\varepsilon, \partial B(x_j^\varepsilon, \varepsilon^{\mu_j})) \leq C(\mu) \quad (5.18)$$

for all $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. We remark that since V_ε is actually smooth, its restriction to the one dimensional set as in (5.18) is actually meaningful. Since (5.18) holds for all $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, it follows that $d_j := \deg(V_\varepsilon, \partial B(x_j^\varepsilon, \varepsilon^{\mu_j}), 0)$ is well defined. By the Structure Theorem (cf. [25], Theorem 2.4), we may assume that the points $(x_j^\varepsilon)_{j=1}^n$ satisfying (5.17), additionally satisfy

$$\left| V_\varepsilon|_{\partial B(x_j^\varepsilon, \varepsilon^{\mu_j})} \right| \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (5.19)$$

$$d_j = +1 \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ sufficiently small.} \quad (5.20)$$

for all $j = 1, \dots, n$. Set

$$\mathbb{D}_\varepsilon := \mathbb{D} \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^n B(x_j^\varepsilon, \varepsilon^{\mu_j}).$$

Next set U_ε to be the solution to the variational problem

$$\inf \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(w, \mathbb{D}_\varepsilon) \quad (5.21)$$

among functions $w \in H^1(\mathbb{D}_\varepsilon)$ with $w|_{\partial \mathbb{D}_\varepsilon} = V_\varepsilon$ and w having the k -fold symmetry property. Existence of minimizers U_ε in this admissible set follows by an easy application of the direct method. Since the Brouwer degree of $V_\varepsilon|_{\partial \mathbb{D}_\varepsilon}$ is zero, the estimate (5.19) along with arguments as in [27] Pg. 615, yield that

$$|U_\varepsilon| \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{ on } \mathbb{D}_\varepsilon.$$

Finally, by compactness we may assume (upon perhaps passing to a subsequence) that $x_j^\varepsilon \rightarrow \bar{a}_j$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ for each $j = 1, \dots, n$, with

$$|\bar{a}_1 - a_1| = \alpha, \quad (5.22)$$

$$|\bar{a}_j - a_j| \leq \alpha, \quad \text{for } j = 2, 3, \dots, n. \quad (5.23)$$

Define the function

$$\bar{V}_\varepsilon(y) := \begin{cases} V_\varepsilon(y) & y \in \bigcup_{j=1}^n B(x_j^\varepsilon, \varepsilon^{\mu_j}), \\ U_\varepsilon(y) & y \in \mathbb{D}_\varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

We will use $\bar{V}_\varepsilon|_{\mathbb{D}_\varepsilon}$ as a competitor to the variational problem (5.21). Then, on the one hand by the energy decreasing property of the gradient flow (5.9)-(5.11),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(\bar{V}_\varepsilon, \mathbb{D}) &\leq \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(V_\varepsilon, \mathbb{D}) \leq \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, 0)) \\ &= \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(w_\varepsilon) \\ &= n \left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma \right) + \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\mathbf{a}) + o_\varepsilon(1). \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

On the other hand, from (5.20) we are led to conclude following [27] and the continuity under weak topology in H^1 of the momentum functional $\mathcal{J}$ that on compact subsets of $\mathbb{D}_\varepsilon$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$

$$U_\varepsilon \rightarrow U_{\mathbf{a}}^* \quad (5.25)$$

where $U_{\bar{\mathbf{a}}}^*$ is the canonical harmonic map associated to the points $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$. In fact we will sketch a different proof of this during the course of the proof of Theorem 5.6. Consequently, by [4] Lemma VIII.2, for any sufficiently small *fixed* $\rho \ll \alpha$, using the notation $\mathbb{D}_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{a}}) := \mathbb{D} \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^n B(\bar{a}_j, \rho)$, we find

$$\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(U_\varepsilon, \mathbb{D}_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{a}})) = n\pi \log \frac{1}{\rho} + \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}) + o_\varepsilon(1) + O(\rho).$$

We will make our choice of ρ (*independently* of ε) at the end of the proof. We can hence conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(\bar{V}_\varepsilon, \mathbb{D}) &= E_\varepsilon(\bar{V}_\varepsilon, \mathbb{D}_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{a}})) + E_\varepsilon\left(\bar{V}_\varepsilon, \bigcup_{j=1}^n B(\bar{a}_j, \rho)\right) - \omega_0 \mathcal{J}(\bar{V}_\varepsilon, \mathbb{D}) \\ &= E_\varepsilon(U_\varepsilon, \mathbb{D}_\rho(\bar{\mathbf{a}})) + E_\varepsilon\left(\bar{V}_\varepsilon, \bigcup_{j=1}^n B(\bar{a}_j, \rho)\right) - \omega_0 \mathcal{J}(\bar{V}_\varepsilon, \mathbb{D}) \\ &\geq n\pi \log \frac{1}{\rho} + \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}) + O(\rho) + o_\varepsilon(1) + nI(\varepsilon, \rho), \\ &\geq n\left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma\right) + \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}) + O(\rho) + o_\varepsilon(1) \end{aligned} \tag{5.26}$$

where, we have used (5.25) and the remarks at the start of the section on the quantity $I(\varepsilon, \rho)$. Finally, we can put together the upper and lower bounds from (5.24)-(5.26) to arrive at

$$\pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}) + O(\rho) - \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\mathbf{a}) \leq o_\varepsilon(1),$$

a contradiction to (5.3), by choosing ρ sufficiently small that $O(\rho)$ terms are controlled by $\min(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \times \frac{\delta_*^2}{50n} > 0$ since $\bar{\mathbf{a}} \notin \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{a}}$ by virtue of (5.22). $\square$

Having proven Claim 5.5, we can now conclude that for each time $m = 1, 2, \dots$, the map $u_\varepsilon(\cdot, m)$ has essential zeroes $b_1^{(m)}, \dots, b_n^{(m)} \in \mathbb{D}$ that are well-defined up to errors that are at most $4\varepsilon^{\alpha_0}$ ([26], Theorem 1.1). By virtue of the symmetry Claim 5.4, we may take $b_1^{(m)}, \dots, b_n^{(m)}$ having the same symmetry property as $\mathbf{a}$. Finally using Claim 5.5 we conclude that

$$\mathbf{b}^{(m)} := (b_1^{(m)}, \dots, b_n^{(m)}) \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{a}}^\alpha \subsetneq \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{a}}^\delta.$$

Using arguments from the proof of the Claim 5.5, we can now prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, m)) &\geq n\left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma\right) + \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\mathbf{b}^{(m)}) + o_\varepsilon(1) \\ &\geq n\left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma\right) + \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\mathbf{a}) + o_\varepsilon(1). \end{aligned} \tag{5.27}$$

By compactness we may assume that as $m \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\mathbf{b}^{(m)} \rightarrow \mathbf{p}_*$ with the k -fold symmetry property. Moreover by Claim 5.5 above, $\mathbf{p}_* \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{a}}^\alpha \subsetneq \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{a}}^{\delta*}$.

Now, on the one hand, by the energy decreasing property of gradient flow, we find for each $t > 0$,

$$\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)) \leq \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(x, 0)) \leq n\left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma\right) + \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\mathbf{a}) + o_\varepsilon(1). \tag{5.28}$$

Using the gradient flow property and Theorem 2 of [45] by L. Simon, we conclude that $v_\varepsilon(x) := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u_\varepsilon(x, t)$ exists for each fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ in H^1 , and is a critical point of $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}$. Furthermore, v_ε is a solution to (3.4)-(3.5) with $\omega = \omega_0$. On the other hand though, for each fixed t , using the energy decreasing property and using (5.27),

$$\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)) \geq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, m)) \geq n \left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma \right) + \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\mathbf{a}) + o_\varepsilon(1).$$

Combining the last two estimates we find that

$$\left| \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t)) - n \left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma \right) - \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\mathbf{a}) \right| = o_\varepsilon(1),$$

uniformly in t as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. Passing to the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\left| \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(v_\varepsilon) - n \left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma \right) - \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\mathbf{a}) \right| = o_\varepsilon(1). \quad (5.29)$$

Plugging this back into the ansatz (3.2) completes the proof of the theorem in the case $S = 1$, i.e. the local minimizer case.

In Steps 6 through 8 we will complete the proof in the case $2 \leq S \leq 2N_R - 1$, i.e. the saddle point case. At that point, with our experience from the local minimizer and saddle point cases, the local maximizer case $S = 2N_R$ will be an easy modification of these earlier cases, and we will briefly pursue it at the end of Step 8.

Step 5: We next use the gradient flow defined in equations (5.9)-(5.11) to deform the set D defined at the end of Step 2 in such a way that the deformed one parameter family of sets stays linked with $D^\perp$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{p}} \in D$ be arbitrary. Note that for each $t \geq 0$, $u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t; \hat{\mathbf{p}}) \in H_{g_n}^1(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$, and by the energy decreasing property of the gradient flow (5.9),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t; \hat{\mathbf{p}})) &\leq \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, 0; \hat{\mathbf{p}})) \\ &= \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(w_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}}^\varepsilon) \\ &= E_\varepsilon(w_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}}^\varepsilon) + \omega_0 \mathcal{J}(w_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}}^\varepsilon) \\ &= N \left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma \right) + \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\hat{\mathbf{p}}, d) + o_\varepsilon(1) \\ &\leq N \left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma \right) + \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, d) + o_\varepsilon(1). \end{aligned} \quad (5.30)$$

where in the last line we have used the fact that $\hat{\mathbf{p}} \in D$.

We will use this observation along with Proposition 3.11 to construct a one parameter family of deformations $h_t(\hat{\mathbf{p}}) = h(t, \hat{\mathbf{p}})$ of $\overline{D}$. Since $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta}$ is a compact subset of $(\mathbb{D}^*)^{N_R}$, our choice of initial data (cf. Equations (5.5) and (5.6)) and estimate (5.30) imply that $\{u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t; \hat{\mathbf{p}}) : \hat{\mathbf{p}} \in \overline{D}\}$ satisfy the hypothesis of Proposition 3.11 for each point $\hat{\mathbf{p}} \in D$, for at least small $t > 0$. Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the projection map that results from Proposition 3.11. For any $\hat{\mathbf{p}} \in \overline{D}$, let $\tau_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}} \geq 0$ to be the first time such that

$$\mathcal{P}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, \tau_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}}; \hat{\mathbf{p}})) \in \partial \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta. \quad (5.31)$$

If $\mathcal{P}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t; \hat{\mathbf{p}})) \notin \partial \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$ for any $t > 0$, then set $\tau_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}} = +\infty$. Given this convention, define

$$h(t, \hat{\mathbf{p}}) := \begin{cases} \hat{\mathbf{p}} & t = 0, \\ \mathcal{P}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t; \hat{\mathbf{p}})) & 0 \leq t \leq \tau_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}}, \\ \mathcal{P}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, \tau_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}}; \hat{\mathbf{p}})) & t \geq \tau_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}}. \end{cases} \quad (5.32)$$

Then it is clear that $h(t, \widehat{\mathbf{p}}) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times D \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta}$ is continuous. Furthermore, if $h(t, \widehat{\mathbf{p}})$ lies in the interior of the set $\mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$ then by Prop. 3.11, $h(t, \widehat{\mathbf{p}})$ is at most $4\varepsilon^{\alpha_0}$ away from the essential zeroes of $u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t; \widehat{\mathbf{p}})$.

Step 6: We claim that the sets $\{h(t, \widehat{\mathbf{q}}) : \widehat{\mathbf{q}} \in \partial D\}$ and $D^\perp$ are homotopically linked for all $t \geq 0$. In other words, we must show that for all time $t \geq 0$,

$$\{h(t, \widehat{\mathbf{q}}) : \widehat{\mathbf{q}} \in \partial D\} \cap D^\perp = \emptyset$$

implies that

$$\{h(t, \widehat{\mathbf{q}}) : \widehat{\mathbf{q}} \in D\} \cap D^\perp \neq \emptyset.$$

To prove this, first observe that $h(0, \widehat{\mathbf{q}}) = \widehat{\mathbf{q}}$, and Claim 5.3 proves the claim for $t = 0$. To prove the claim for $t > 0$, let $\sigma > 0$ be small, such that

$$\text{If } \widehat{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta, \text{dist}(\widehat{\mathbf{y}}, \partial D^\perp) < 2\sigma, \quad \text{then } \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{y}}) \geq \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{a}}) + \frac{2\delta_1}{3}. \quad (5.33)$$

Sub-claim $\mathfrak{C}_1$: For $t > 0$, if $\widehat{\mathbf{q}} \in \partial D$, then $\text{dist}(h(t, \widehat{\mathbf{q}}), \mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta) > \delta - \frac{\sigma}{4}$.

Sub-claim $\mathfrak{C}_2$: For $t > 0$, if $\widehat{\mathbf{q}} \in \partial D$, then $\text{dist}(h(t, \widehat{\mathbf{q}}), \partial D^\perp) \geq 2\sigma > 0$.

Granting these two sub-claims for now, they would imply that $\{h(t, \widehat{\mathbf{q}}) : \widehat{\mathbf{q}} \in \partial D\} \cap D^\perp = \emptyset$ for all $t \geq 0$. Furthermore, $h(0, \widehat{\mathbf{p}}) = \widehat{\mathbf{p}}$ for all $\widehat{\mathbf{p}} \in \overline{D}$ by definition; letting $\Pi : \overline{\mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta} \rightarrow D$ denote the projection map, we conclude

$$\deg(\Pi \circ h(t, \partial D), \partial D, 0) \text{ is well-defined.}$$

Consequently, by the homotopy invariance of Brouwer degree,

$$\deg(\Pi \circ h(0, \partial D), \partial D, 0) = \deg(\Pi \circ \text{id}|_{\partial D}, \partial D, 0) = \deg(\text{id}, \partial D, 0) = 1.$$

This proves that $\{h(t, \widehat{\mathbf{q}}) : \widehat{\mathbf{q}} \in \partial D\}$ and $D^\perp$ are homotopically linked.

It remains to prove Sub-claims $\mathfrak{C}_1$ and $\mathfrak{C}_2$. We will prove Sub-claim $\mathfrak{C}_1$; the proof of Sub-claim $\mathfrak{C}_2$ is very similar.

Proof of Sub-claim $\mathfrak{C}_1$: Suppose to the contrary that there exists $\widehat{\mathbf{p}} \in \partial D$ such that $\text{dist}(h(t, \widehat{\mathbf{p}}), \mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta) \leq \delta - \frac{\sigma}{4}$ for some $t > 0$. Then up to errors that are at most $4\varepsilon^{\alpha_0}$, we have $h(t, \widehat{\mathbf{p}})$ are the essential zeroes of $u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t; \widehat{\mathbf{p}})$. Then following arguments similar to those in the proof of Claim 5.5 there exists ρ_1 independent of ε , such that for $0 < \rho < \rho_1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t; \widehat{\mathbf{p}})) &\geq N\pi \log \frac{1}{\rho} + N\pi I(\varepsilon, \rho) + \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(h(t, \widehat{\mathbf{p}})) + O(\rho) + o_\varepsilon(1) \\ &\geq N\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + N\gamma + \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(h(t, \widehat{\mathbf{p}})) + O(\rho) + o_\varepsilon(1). \end{aligned}$$

In the second inequality we have used the definition and properties of the constant γ from (5.8), Pg.24. By comparing this estimate to (5.30), we get a contradiction to (5.3) upon choosing $\rho \ll \delta - \frac{\sigma}{4}$. This completes the proof of Sub-claim $\mathfrak{C}_1$. The proof of Sub-claim $\mathfrak{C}_2$ is identical, and this completes Step 6.

Step 7: In this step we prove an inf – sup characterization of the critical point. Define now

$$c_\varepsilon := \inf_{t > 0} \sup_{\widehat{\mathbf{p}} \in \overline{D}} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t; \widehat{\mathbf{p}})) \quad (5.34)$$

Claim: c_ε is a critical value of $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}$.

Proof of claim: Suppose to the contrary that c_ε is a regular value of $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}$. Then by Lemma 3.2, there exist positive numbers $\eta_1, \eta_2 > 0$, such that if

$$|\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u) - c_\varepsilon| < \eta_1 \quad (5.35)$$

then

$$|\nabla \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u)| > \eta_2. \quad (5.36)$$

By definition of infimum, there exists $t_0 > 0$, such that

$$c_\varepsilon \leq \sup_{\widehat{\mathbf{p}} \in \overline{D}} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t_0; \widehat{\mathbf{p}})) \leq c_\varepsilon + \eta_1. \quad (5.37)$$

But by the energy decreasing property of the gradient flow (5.9) and the definition (5.34), it follows that (5.37) holds for all $t \geq t_0$. But this means that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sup_{\widehat{\mathbf{p}} \in \overline{D}} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t; \widehat{\mathbf{p}})) = -|\nabla \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u)|^2 \leq -\eta_2^2, \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_0.$$

This immediately yields a contradiction to the definition of c_ε , cf. (5.34), for $t \geq t_0 + \frac{1}{\eta_2^2}$. This completes the proof of the Claim.

Step 8: Finally, we conclude the proof of our existence Theorem 5.1 following [26]. From Step 6 it follows that for each time $m = 1, 2, \dots$, there exists $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}_m \in D$ such that $h(m, \widehat{\mathbf{p}}_m) \in D^\perp$. By arguments similar to those in the proof of Claim 5.5 we also conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, m; \widehat{\mathbf{p}}_m)) &\geq N \left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma \right) + \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(h(m, \widehat{\mathbf{p}}_m)) + o_\varepsilon(1), \\ &\geq N \left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma \right) + \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{a}}) + o_\varepsilon(1) \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we have used the fact that $h(m, \widehat{\mathbf{p}}_m) \in D^\perp$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that (possibly upon passing to a subsequence) $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}_m \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{p}}_*$. Using the energy decreasing nature of (5.9) it follows that for any fixed $t > 0$,

$$\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t; \widehat{\mathbf{p}}_*)) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t; \widehat{\mathbf{p}}_m)) \geq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, m; \widehat{\mathbf{p}}_m)).$$

The last two estimates imply that

$$\left| \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t; \widehat{\mathbf{p}}_*)) - N \left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma \right) - \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{a}}) \right| = o_\varepsilon(1)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ uniformly in t . Since the dependence of $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}$ on $u, \nabla u$ is analytic, we may use the gradient flow structure of (5.9) and [45], Theorem 2 to conclude that the limit

$$v_\varepsilon(\cdot) := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u_\varepsilon(\cdot, t; \widehat{\mathbf{p}}_*) \quad (5.38)$$

exists in H^1 , and is a critical point of $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}$, solving the PDE (3.4)-(3.5). This completes the proof of the fact that there exists a critical point v_ε of $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}$ having the k -fold symmetry property, as in (5.7). Furthermore v_ε satisfies

$$\left| \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(v_\varepsilon) - N \left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma \right) - \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{a}}) \right| = o_\varepsilon(1) \quad (5.39)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

The case $S = 2N_R$ remains, and is now fairly easy. Define the one parameter family of deformations $\{h(t, \hat{\mathbf{p}}) : \hat{\mathbf{p}} \in D\}$ as in the saddle case. Then similar to the saddle case, for each $m = 1, 2, \dots$, it can be shown by easy degree theory arguments as before that there exist $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_m \in D$ such that $h(m, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_m) = \hat{\mathbf{a}}$. This sequence of points gives us the necessary estimates and we reach similar conclusions as in the local minimizer and the saddle cases.

In summary, for critical points $\mathbf{a}$ of the functional $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ as are under consideration, for ε sufficiently small we have obtained critical points v_ε of $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}$ with the same symmetry property as $\mathbf{a}$ satisfying the estimate

$$\left| \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^{\omega_0}(v_\varepsilon) - N \left(\pi \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \gamma \right) - \pi \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\mathbf{a}, d) \right| = o_\varepsilon(1) \quad (5.40)$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

We are (finally!) ready to plug back the ansatz (3.2) to obtain a time periodic solution of the Gross-Pitaevskii equation (1.1) whose period is $T = \frac{2\pi m}{\omega_0}$. This completes the proof of the theorem concerning existence of a time periodic solution to (1.1) also possessing the symmetry property (5.1). $\square$

Our next main theorem concerns the $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ asymptotics of the periodic solutions constructed in Theorem 5.1.

Theorem 5.6. *Let $(\mathbf{a}(t), d)$ be as in the previous theorem, and let $u_\varepsilon(x, t)$ be the corresponding time periodic solution constructed there. Then there exists $\theta_* \in [0, 2\pi)$ such that*

$$Ju_\varepsilon(\cdot, t) \rightharpoonup \pi \sum_{i=1}^N d_i \delta_{e(\theta_*)a_i(t)}, \quad (5.41)$$

for each fixed $t \in \mathbb{R}$, where the convergence is in the weak-* topology of $(C_c^{0, \alpha}(\mathbb{D}))^*$ for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

In fact, our proof will show something in addition to (5.41): let v_ε be related to u_ε as in the statement of the previous theorem. Our proof will show that there exists a finite set $F \subset \mathbb{D}$ with exactly N points such that as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, we have, for each $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$ and each compact set $K \subset \mathbb{D} \setminus F$ the convergence $v_\varepsilon \rightarrow v_*$ holds in $C^\kappa(K)$. Moreover, $|v_*| = 1$ on $\mathbb{D} \setminus F$ and in fact, v_* is a smooth harmonic map on $\mathbb{D} \setminus F$ in the sense that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta v_* + |Dv_*|^2 v_* &= 0, & \mathbb{D} \setminus F, \\ v_*|_{\partial \mathbb{D}} &= e(n\theta). \end{aligned}$$

It is natural to wonder why the angular speed ω_0 which appeared on the RHS of the PDE's for v_ε seemingly disappears in the limiting PDE for v_* . We show an analogue of the so-called *vanishing gradient property* from [4] in which we recover the angular speed ω_0 . Indeed, it appears as a sort of Lagrange multiplier for the renormalized energy, thereby deciding vortex location.

The proof of Theorem 5.6 requires the following Pohozhaev identity.

Lemma 5.7. *Let v_ε be as in Theorem 5.1. Then*

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial \mathbb{D}} \left| \frac{\partial v_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} \right|^2 - \pi n^2 + \int_{\mathbb{D}} \frac{(1 - |v_\varepsilon|^2)^2}{2\varepsilon^2} = \omega_0 k \left(\pi - \int_{\mathbb{D}} |v_\varepsilon|^2 dy \right) - \frac{\omega_0}{m} \int_{\mathbb{D}} |y|^2 (Jv_\varepsilon) dy. \quad (5.42)$$

Proof of Lemma 5.7. Recall that the function v_ε satisfies the Elliptic PDE (3.4)-(3.5). Then, the proof of this Pohazaev identity proceeds as usual by taking the dot product on $(y \cdot \nabla v_\varepsilon)$ with each side of the PDE (3.4). We suppress the dependence of v on ε for the sake of clarity. We obtain,

$$(y \cdot \nabla v) \cdot \left(\Delta v + \frac{v(1-|v|^2)}{\varepsilon^2} \right) = \omega_0 k(y \cdot \nabla v) \cdot v + \frac{\omega_0}{m} (y \cdot \nabla v) \cdot (y^\perp \cdot \nabla v^\perp).$$

We integrate on $\mathbb{D}$ and proceed as usual. Since the calculations for the terms on the left hand side, and the first term on the right hand side are fairly standard, we only compute that

$$\begin{aligned} (y \cdot \nabla v) \cdot (y^\perp \cdot \nabla v^\perp) &= -|y|^2 (\partial_1 v^1 \partial_2 v^2 - \partial_1 v^2 \partial_2 v^1) \\ &= -|y|^2 (Jv). \end{aligned}$$

where $\partial_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}$. This completes the proof of Pohazaev's identity. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 5.6. Thanks to the energy estimate (5.2), we can apply the Compactness Theorem 3.7. This says that $Jv_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup J$ where $J = \pi \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} k_i \delta_{\alpha_i}$, in the dual Sobolev space $W^{-1,1}(\mathbb{D})$ (cf. remarks following Theorem 3.9). Here $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{D}$, $k_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} |k_i|$ is bounded independently of ε . The exact details of $\alpha_i, k_i, \mathcal{N}$ do not matter for the time being since we are only interested in obtaining a uniform estimate on the potential term. Then writing

$$\int_{\mathbb{D}} |y|^2 (Jv_\varepsilon) dy = \int_{\mathbb{D}} (|y|^2 - 1) (Jv_\varepsilon) dy + \int_{\mathbb{D}} Jv_\varepsilon dy,$$

since $(|y|^2 - 1)|_{\partial\mathbb{D}} = 0$, by the remarks following Theorem 3.9 we find $\int_{\mathbb{D}} (|y|^2 - 1) (Jv_\varepsilon) dy \rightarrow \pi \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} k_i (|\alpha_i|^2 - 1)$. Finally, by Stokes' theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{D}} Jv_\varepsilon dy &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{D}} \nabla \times j(v_\varepsilon) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} j(v_\varepsilon) \cdot d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} (iv_\varepsilon, (v_\varepsilon)_\theta) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} n d\theta = n\pi. \end{aligned}$$

Putting these together, we obtain that

$$\int_{\mathbb{D}} \frac{(1-|v_\varepsilon|^2)^2}{2\varepsilon^2} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} \left| \frac{\partial v_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} \right|^2 \leq C(N, n, k, m, \omega_0). \quad (5.43)$$

Consequently, following the analysis of Chapter X, [4] using the estimate (5.2), Lemma 3.3, and (5.43) we conclude that upon possibly passing to a sub-sequence $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, there exist distinct limiting vortex locations $(b_1, d_1), \dots, (b_N, d_N)$ with $b_i \in \mathbb{D}$, and there exists $v_* \in C^\infty(\mathbb{D} \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_N\}; \mathbb{S}^1)$ satisfying the following:

- For every $1 \leq p < 2$, one has $\|v_{\varepsilon_n}\|_{W^{1,p}(\mathbb{D})} \leq C_p$.
- For any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{D} \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_N\}$ and for any natural number $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|v_{\varepsilon_n} - v_*\|_{C^\kappa(K)} \leq C(\kappa, K) \varepsilon_n^2, \quad (5.44)$$

for ε_n sufficiently small.

- $|v_*| = 1$. This comes from (5.43).
- With K and κ as in the preceding item,

$$\left\| \frac{1 - |v_{\varepsilon_n}|^2}{\varepsilon_n^2} - |\nabla v_*|^2 \right\|_{C^\kappa(K)} \leq C(\kappa, K) \varepsilon_n^2 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.45)$$

- The limiting vortex locations $(b_1, \dots, b_N) \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a}}^\delta$.
- In fact, $v_{\varepsilon_n} \rightarrow v_*$ in $H^1(V)$ for any $V \subset \subset \mathbb{D} \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_N\}$. Consequently, using a standard diagonalization argument and using (5.44)-(5.45),

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta v_* + |\nabla v_*|^2 v_* &= 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{D} \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_N\} \\ v_*|_{\partial \mathbb{D}} &= g_n. \end{aligned} \quad (5.46)$$

Here is a different way to derive (5.46). Passing to the limit in v_ε , we find that on $\mathbb{D} \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_N\}$, we have

$$\Delta v_* + |\nabla v_*|^2 v_* = \omega_0 \left(k v_* + \frac{1}{m} (y^\perp \cdot \nabla v_*^\perp) \right).$$

Then, using the condition that $|v_*| = 1$ on $\mathbb{D} \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_N\}$, we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} v_* \times \omega_0 \left(k v_* + \frac{1}{m} (y^\perp \cdot \nabla v_*^\perp) \right) &= \frac{\omega_0}{m} (v_*^{(1)}, v_*^{(2)}) \times (y_1 \partial_2 - y_2 \partial_1) (-v_*^{(2)}, v_*^{(1)}) \\ &= \frac{\omega_0}{m} (y_1 \partial_2 - y_2 \partial_1) |v_*|^2 \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

and so,

$$v_* \times \Delta v_* = 0.$$

But the conditions $|v_*| = 1$ and $v_* \times \Delta v_* = 0$ easily imply that v_* solves the harmonic map PDE, and consequently on $\mathbb{D} \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_N\}$,

$$k v_* + \frac{1}{m} (y^\perp \cdot \nabla v_*^\perp) = 0.$$

It now follows by Hélein's regularity theorem (cf. [15]) that v_* is the canonical harmonic map associated with the points $\{(b_1, d_1), \dots, (b_N, d_N)\}$. We remark that this argument was also used in [43], and earlier still, in [34].

Finally, we show that $(b_1, d_1), \dots, (b_N, d_N)$ is a critical point of $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$. This will complete the proof of the theorem, since all critical points of $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathbf{a}}^\delta$, lie on the critical circle $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a}}$. This claim, will follow by an analogue of what is called the *vanishing gradient property* in [4]: we derive it using some Pohazaev-type identities, cf. [4], pp. 74. To this end, we know from the foregoing paragraph that near each b_j , we may write $v_*(x) = e^{i(d_j \Theta_j + H_j)(x)}$, where H_j is a real Harmonic function near (and including) b_j , and Θ_j is the angle relative to polar coordinates with pole at b_j . Moreover, by Theorem VIII.3 of [4], for *any* $c \in (\mathbb{D}^*)^M$, where M is some positive integer,

$$DW(c) = 2\pi \left[d_1 \left(-\frac{\partial H_1}{\partial x_2}(c_1), \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial x_1}(c_1) \right), \dots, d_M \left(-\frac{\partial H_M}{\partial x_2}(c_M), \frac{\partial H_M}{\partial x_1}(c_M) \right) \right]. \quad (5.47)$$

In the present case, let $R > 0$ be sufficiently small so that $\overline{B_{2R}(b_1)}$ does not contain any other $b_j, j > 1$, nor does it meet the boundary. We begin by taking the dot product of both sides of our elliptic PDE

$$\Delta v_\varepsilon + \frac{v_\varepsilon(1 - |v_\varepsilon|^2)}{\varepsilon^2} = \omega_0 \left(kv_\varepsilon + \frac{1}{m}(y^\perp \cdot \nabla)v_\varepsilon^\perp \right) \quad (5.48)$$

with $\frac{\partial v_\varepsilon}{\partial y_1}$. Integrating the result on $B_R(b_1)$, we find upon performing some integrations by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial B_R(b_1)} \frac{\partial v_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} \cdot \frac{\partial v_\varepsilon}{\partial y_1} - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla v_\varepsilon|^2 (\nu \cdot e_1) - \int_{\partial B_R(b_1)} \frac{(1 - |v_\varepsilon|^2)^2}{4\varepsilon^2} (\nu \cdot e_1) \\ = \omega_0 \int_{\partial B_R(b_1)} \frac{k}{2} |v_\varepsilon|^2 (\nu \cdot e_1) - \frac{\omega_0}{m} \int_{B_R(b_1)} y_1 (Jv_\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ with R fixed, we find using the Jacobian estimate, Theorem 3.9 for the last term that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial B_R(b_1)} \frac{\partial v_*}{\partial \nu} \cdot \frac{\partial v_*}{\partial y_1} - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla v_*|^2 (\nu \cdot e_1) &= \omega_0 \frac{k}{2} \int_{\partial B_R(b_1)} (\nu \cdot e_1) - \pi \frac{\omega_0}{m} d_1(b_1)^{(1)} \\ &= -\pi \frac{\omega_0}{m} d_1(b_1)^{(1)} \end{aligned}$$

In the above, ν denotes the unit normal vector to $\partial B_R(b_1)$. Let τ denote the unit tangent vector to $\partial B_R(b_1)$, chosen such that the pair (ν, τ) preserves the orientation in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Then, following [4], we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla v_*|^2 &= |\nabla(d_1\Theta_1 + H_1)|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{R^2} + \frac{2d_1}{R} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \tau} + |\nabla H_1|^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial v_*}{\partial \nu} \cdot \frac{\partial v_*}{\partial y_1} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} (d_1\Theta_1 + H_1) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} (d_1\Theta_1 + H_1) \\ &= \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \nu} \cdot \left(d_1 \frac{\tau \cdot e_1}{R} + \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial y_1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining, we find

$$- \int_{\partial B_R(b_1)} \left(\frac{d_1}{R} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \tau} + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla H_1|^2 \right) (\nu \cdot e_1) + \int_{\partial B_R} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \nu} \cdot \left(d_1 \frac{\tau \cdot e_1}{R} + \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial y_1} \right) = -\pi \frac{\omega_0}{m} d_1(b_1)^{(1)}.$$

On the other hand, since $\Delta H_1 = 0$, multiplying by $\frac{\partial H_1}{\partial y_1}$ and integrating, we obtain

$$- \int_{\partial B_R(b_1)} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \nu} \cdot \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial y_1} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial B_R(b_1)} |\nabla H_1|^2 (\nu \cdot e_1) = 0.$$

Adding these last two equations and dividing through by d_1 , we find

$$-\frac{1}{R} \int_{\partial B_R} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \tau} (\nu \cdot e_1) + \frac{1}{R} \int_{\partial B_R} (\tau \cdot e_1) \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \nu} = -\pi \frac{\omega_0}{m} (b_1)^{(1)}.$$

By symmetry, a similar identity holds in the e_2 direction. Together, we find

$$-\frac{1}{R} \int_{\partial B_R(b_1)} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \tau} \nu + \frac{1}{R} \int_{\partial B_R(b_1)} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \nu} \tau = -\pi \frac{\omega_0}{m} ((b_1)^{(1)}, (b_1)^{(2)}). \quad (5.49)$$

Applying the mean value property to the harmonic functions $\frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \tau}, \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \nu}$, we conclude that

$$2\pi(\nabla H_1(b_1))^\perp = -\pi \frac{\omega_0}{m} b_1. \quad (5.50)$$

A similar identity holds at all $b_j, j = 1, \dots, N$. Putting these together with (5.47), we find

$$D_{b_j} W(b_j) = 2\pi d_j (\nabla H_j(b_j))^\perp = -d_j \pi \frac{\omega_0}{m} b_j. \quad (5.51)$$

Dividing through by π , we note from (2.20) that this says that $\nabla \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\mathbf{b}, d) = 0$. This completes the proof of the theorem. $\square$

Remark 5.8. In this remark, we explain how Assumption A (cf. Page 20) can be relaxed substantially: we were motivated about this relaxation by the remarks in [27], pg. 618. Let $\hat{\mathbf{a}} \in (\mathbb{D}^*)^{N_R}$ be a relative equilibrium. We may relax the Assumption A to the following: we assume that the real $2N_R \times 2N_R$ matrix $D^2 \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\hat{\mathbf{a}})$ has at least one non-zero eigenvalue. Suppose that the number of 0 eigenvalues of $D^2 \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\hat{\mathbf{a}})$ is Z , with $1 \leq Z < 2N_R$. Next, consider the connected component of the level set of the functional $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ containing the point $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}} := \{\hat{\mathbf{b}} \in (\mathbb{D}^*)^{N_R} : \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}) = \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}), \nabla \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}) = 0\}.$$

Then the set $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ is clearly closed and bounded. Consequently, it is compact. Moreover, since the function $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ is smooth in $(\mathbb{D}^*)^{N_R}$, by the Rank Theorem, cf. [32] Theorem 1.3.14 or [5] Theorem 7.1, we conclude that $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ is a compact connected Z -dimensional smooth sub-manifold. We next argue that the rotational invariance of $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ leads to $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ being foliated by simple smooth closed curves.

Indeed, using the rotational invariance of the functional $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$, for any point $\hat{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$, we find $e(\theta)\hat{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$. Consequently, as before, denoting $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}} := \{e(\theta)\hat{\mathbf{p}} : \theta \in [0, 2\pi)\}$, for any other point $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \in \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$, if for some $\phi \in [0, 2\pi)$ we have $e(\phi)\hat{\mathbf{q}} \in \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}}$, then necessarily $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \in \mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}}$. Hence, $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ is foliated by simple smooth curves of the form $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}}$, with $\hat{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$.

Given this set up, by the Tubular Neighborhood Theorem from Differential Topology (cf. [10], Page 76), there exists a tubular neighborhood $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$ with $\delta > 0$ small, which affords ortho-normal local coordinates similar to the one described for the set $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$ in Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 5.1. Using these coordinates, we can once again write down a Taylor development of the function $\mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}$ in the neighborhood $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$ similar to (5.3).

Now given a point $\hat{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$, let $B_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}}$ denote the set of points in $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\delta$ whose nearest point in $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ is $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$. By the Tubular Neighborhood Theorem, this set is well defined and lies in a plane normal to $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ at $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$, i.e. the orthogonal complement in $\mathbb{R}^{2N_R}$ of the tangent space $T_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}} \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ to $\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ at $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$. We may use the eigenvectors of $D^2 \mathcal{H}^{n, \omega_0}(\hat{\mathbf{p}})$ that are orthogonal to $T_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}} \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}$ to parametrize $B_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}}$. Then as in the proof of Theorem 5.1, we obtain the linking structure, using the positive and negative eigen-directions. It is then clear that the proofs of the two Theorems modify easily through obvious changes.

Remark 5.9. Note in light of Remark 3.1 and the relative equilibria to (PVF) that we have constructed in Section 2, corresponding to each positive integer k , our Theorems 5.1-5.6 establish the existence of time-periodic solutions to Gross Pitaevskii equation (1.1)-(1.2) with k -fold symmetry, that follow relative equilibria to (PVF) having two rings, one containing k vortices of degree $+1$ and another containing k vortices of degree -1 .

Remark 5.10. In light of our results, it is natural to ask if symmetry is the right criterion to classify all *relative equilibria* to the Gross-Pitaevskii equation. Our theorems indicate that the answer to this question relies entirely on the answer to the corresponding question posed for relative equilibria for (PVF).

References

- [1] Aref, H. Integrable, chaotic, and turbulent vortex motion in two-dimensional flows *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics*, **15** (1983) 345-389.
- [2] Aref, H.; Newton, P.; Stremler, M.; Tokieda, T.; Vainchtein, D. Vortex crystals, *Advances in applied Mechanics*, **39** (2003) 1-79.
- [3] Bartsch, T.; Dai, Q. Periodic solutions of the N-vortex Hamiltonian system in planar domains, *Journal of Differential Equations*, **260**, 2275-2295 (2016).
- [4] Bethuel, F.; Brezis, H.; Hélein, F. Ginzburg Landau Vortices, *Birkhauser* (1994).
- [5] Boothby, W. M. *An introduction to differentiable manifolds and Riemannian geometry*. Second edition. Pure and Applied Mathematics, **120**. Academic Press, Inc., Orlando, FL, (1986).
- [6] Colliander, J.; Jerrard, R. Vortex dynamics for the Ginzburg-Landau Schrödinger equation, *IMRN*(1998),333-358.
- [7] Colliander, J.; Jerrard, R. Ginzburg-Landau vortices: weak stability and Schrödinger equation dynamics, *Journal d'Analyse Mathématique*, **77** no. 1, 129-205, (1999), Springer.
- [8] Dai, Q. *Periodic solutions of the N point vortex problem in planar domains*. PhD thesis.
- [9] Dalfovo, F., Giorgini, S., Pitaevskii, L. P., Stringari, S. Theory of Bose-Einstein condensation in trapped gases, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, **71**, no. 3, pp. 463-512, (1999), APS.
- [10] Guillemin, V., Pollack, A. *Differential topology*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., (1974). xvi+222 pp.
- [11] Kurakin, L. G. Stability, resonances, and instability of regular vortex polygons in a circular domain, *Doklady Physics*, **49**, 658-661, (2004), Springer.
- [12] Gelantalis, M.; Sternberg, P. Rotating $2N$ -vortex solutions to the Gross-Pitaevskii equation on $\mathbb{S}^2$. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, **53** (2012), 083701.
- [13] Jerrard, R.; Sonner, H.M. The Jacobian and the Ginzburg-Landau energy, *Calc. of Var. PDE.*, **14**, 151-191, (2002), Springer.
- [14] Gilbarg, D. and Trudinger, N.S., *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, (2015) Springer.
- [15] Hélein, F. Régularité des applications faiblement harmoniques entre une surface et une variété riemannienne. (French) *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **312** (1991), no. 8, 591-596.
- [16] Jerrard, R.L. Lower Bounds for Generalized Ginzburg-Landau Functionals, *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, **30**, no. 4, 721-746, (1999), SIAM.
- [17] Jerrard, R.L., Montero, A., Sternberg, P. Local minimizers of the Ginzburg-Landau energy with magnetic field in three dimensions. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **249** (2004), no. 3, 549-577.

- [18] Jerrard, R., Spirn, D. Refined Jacobian estimates and Gross–Pitaevsky vortex dynamics, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **190**, no.3, 425-475, (2008), Springer.
- [19] Jerrard, R. L.; Spirn, D. Hydrodynamic limit of the Gross-Pitaevskii equation. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 40 (2015), no. 2, 135190.
- [20] Jerrard, R. L., Soner, H. M. Dynamics of Ginzburg-Landau vortices. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **142** (1998), no. 2, 99–125.
- [21] Jerrard, R. L.; Sternberg, P. Critical points via Γ -convergence: general theory and applications. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, **11**, (2009), no. 4, 705–753.
- [22] Kohn, R.V., Sternberg, P. Local minimisers and singular perturbations. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **111** (1989), no. 1-2, 69-84.
- [23] Koiller J., De Carvalho, S., Da Silva, R., De Oliveira, L., On Aref’s vortex motions with a symmetry center, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, **16**, ,no. 1, pp.27-61, (1985), Elsevier.
- [24] Lewis, D.; Ratiu, T. Rotating n -gon/ kn -gon vortex configurations, *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, **6** (1996) 385-414.
- [25] Lin, F-H. Some dynamical properties of Ginzburg-Landau vortices. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **49** (1996), no. 4, 323-359.
- [26] Lin, F-H.; Lin, T-C. Minimax solutions of the Ginzburg-Landau equations. *Selecta Mathematica, New Series*, **3** (1997), 99-113.
- [27] Lin, F-H. Solutions of Ginzburg-Landau equations and critical points of the renormalized energy, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré* **12** (1995) 599-622.
- [28] Lin, F-H.; Xin, JX. On the incompressible fluid limit and the vortex motion law of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, *Communications in mathematical physics* **200**(1999), 249-274.
- [29] Madison, K.W.; Chevy, F.; Wohlleben, W.; Dalibard, J. Vortex formation in a stirred Bose-Einstein condensate, *Physical Review Letters*, **84**, no.5, 806-809, (2000), APS.
- [30] Marchioro, C.; Pulvirenti, M. *Mathematical theory of incompressible nonviscous fluids*. Applied Mathematical Sciences, 96. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994. xii+283 pp.
- [31] Montero, J. A., Sternberg, P., Ziemer, W. P. Local minimizers with vortices in the Ginzburg-Landau system in three dimensions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **57** (2004), no. 1, 99–125.
- [32] Narasimhan, R. *Analysis on real and complex manifolds*. Advanced Studies in Pure Mathematics, Vol. 1 Masson and Cie, Éditeurs, Paris; North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam (1968) x+246 pp.
- [33] Newton, P. K., *The N -vortex problem: analytical techniques*, **145**, (2013), Springer Science & Business Media.
- [34] Rubinstein, J., Sternberg, P., Keller, J. B. Reaction-diffusion processes and evolution to harmonic maps. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **49** (1989), no. 6, 1722-1733.

- [35] Sandier, E., Lower bounds for the energy of unit vector fields and applications, *Journal of functional analysis*, **152**, no. 2, 379-403, (1998), Elsevier.
- [36] Sandier, E.; Serfaty, S. Gamma-convergence of gradient flows with applications to Ginzburg-Landau. *Communications on Pure and Applied mathematics*, **57** (2004) ,1627-1672.
- [37] Sandier, S.; Serfaty, S. *Vortices in the magnetic Ginzburg-Landau model*, **70**, (2008), Springer Science & Business Media.
- [38] Serfaty, S. Gamma-convergence of gradient flows on Hilbert and metric spaces and applications. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **31** (2011), no. 4, 1427-1451.
- [39] Serfaty, S. Mean Field Limits of the Gross-Pitaevskii and Parabolic Ginzburg-Landau Equations. Arxiv Preprint: arXiv:1507.03821.
- [40] Serfaty, S. Stability in 2d Ginzburg Landau passes to the limit, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **54**,no.1 (2005),199-221.
- [41] Spirn, Daniel Vortex dynamics of the full time-dependent Ginzburg-Landau equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 55 (2002), no. 5, 537-581.
- [42] Speetjens, M.F.M; Meleshko, V.V.; Van Heijst, G.J. Spectral analysis of point-vortex dynamics: first application to vortex polygons in a circular domain, *Fluid Dynamics Research*, **46**, pp.031402, (2014) ,IOP Publishing.
- [43] Struwe, M. On the asymptotic behavior of minimizers of the Ginzburg-Landau model in 2 dimensions, *Differential Integral Equations*, **7** (1994), no. 5-6, 1613-1624.
- [44] Struwe, M. *Variational methods. Applications to nonlinear partial differential equations and Hamiltonian systems. Second edition.* Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)], **34**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1996). xvi+272 pp.
- [45] Simon, L. Asymptotics for a class of non-linear evolution equations, with applications to geometric problems, *Annals of Mathematics*, 525-571 (1983) JSTOR.
- [46] Smoller, J. *Shock waves and Reaction Diffusion Equations*, **258**, (1994), Springer Science & Business Media.
- [47] Thomson, J.J. A Treatise on the Motion of Vortex Rings: an essay to which the Adams prize was adjudged in 1882, in the University of Cambridge (1883).